

ANCIENT AND MEDIEVAL NEPAL

By

D. R. REGMI

KATHMANDU
NEPAL
1952

Price Rs. [redacted]/-

Printed at Prem Printing Press, Lucknow.

To

THE MEMORY OF DARLING

KALYANI

MY LATE WIFE

CONTENTS

Preface

CHAPTER I — Page

Introductory i

The Origins of the Newars of Kathmandu 1

The Newars of Kathmandu 11

The Art and Architecture in Nepal 23

CHAPTER II

Early Nepal 37

CHAPTER III

Amshuvarman and his Successors 76

CHAPTER IV

Medieval Nepal 129

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EI — Epigraphica Indica

IA — Indian Antiquary

IHQ — Indian Historical Quarterly

JASB — Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal

JBORS — Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society

JRAS — Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

GI — Gupta Inscriptions

PREFACE

A draft manuscript of this Ancient and Medieval History of Nepal was prepared in early 1942 after a three year research into varied materials, most of them absolutely original. This, however, could not see the light of publication at the time, as subsequently after it fell into the hands of the Indian C. I. D., when the author himself was arrested and detained for extradition to Nepal. Even after the release the publication had been ordered by numerous other factors particularly the illness of the author and later on his preoccupation with the political movement in Nepal. Also the portions of the manuscript on Medieval Nepal was lost from the custody of the police, which necessitated rewriting and partly in its turn contributed to complicate the question of publication.

The author is sorry that the book is appearing after inordinate delay, but he is glad that this period of forced withdrawal of the publication provided for him sufficient time to check up again and again the materials he had used, seek new sources and verify and supplement them and adopt changes in the light of further research. And the book which has emerged in that course has certainly advanced both in the finis and standard because it comes after making up the deficiencies of the original manuscript.

So far any history of Nepal, and there are very few of them, happened to be written by foreigners whose idea of the country could not at all be intimate. The special feature of the present book is that this is written by a son of Nepal born and bred up in Nepalese soil, and the writer's long and intimate association with the country is visible to careful readers as far as mistakes readily committed by alien scholars and wrong reading of the data and interpretation based theron have been corrected.

But I do not claim to have completed the research into the subject matter. There is a vast oceanic material on the history of Nepal. Much of it is still in dark. All the works thus far incorporated form a very

tiny portion of the entire mass of undiscovered materials. It will not be a surprise if many of the conclusions reached in my work lose ground as new sources of the history of Nepal gradually unfold themselves. But the process in this direction has to be first started, then assisted and facilitated. I draw the attention of the Indologists all the world over to this common task of collecting materials for our history and of the Nepalese scholars in particular to devote themselves solely to the field of research into the past of their country. This is a task which has got to be taken up very seriously at the earliest moment.

The readers' attention is also invited to the forthcoming publication of another chapter of Nepalese history written by the author. This is going to appear with the title ' Nepal under the House of Gorkha ' and will cover a period of history from 1646-1846. The final publication will, however, depend on how far the author who is immensely preoccupied will find time to look into the draft material in hand and to give it a finishing touch needed before it goes to the print.

Lastly, let me extend my cordial thanks to all those who have cooperated in my work and also request the men of learning interested on this subject to help me by their valuable suggestions which can be incorporated in the next edition.

CHAPTER I

Introductory

The political boundary of Nepal at the present moment extends to lines very much farther than what they used to be in the ancient times. In ancient times by Nepal only the valley of Kathmandu was known, and the state which came into existence under the same name could not include areas of expansion of more than one hundred miles on both sides. Again, surrounded on all sides by inaccessible mountains and forest belt Nepal was like an oasis of civilization and the wonder of wonders was the thick human habitation in it and the high culture evolved with the same.

The valley of Nepal is approached from the south through the Sub-Himalayan chains of hills after passing two such, the Mahabharata and the allied ridge, at an interior site some sixty miles north of the Indo-Gangetic plain. Although all the ridges could be crossed on foot, the difficulties of the throughbfare were not in any way less, and even at the time when the valley had advanced to a stage of civilization its inaccessibility was a factor that could obtain no easy solution. One of the Buddhist Jatakas gives a picture of the situation saying that Lord Buddha discouraged his disciples to undertake a journey across as the same was full of perils for reasons of wild beasts and tribes haunting the highways.

But the valley has fertile soil with rainfall not scanty and in addition it is a flat surface of wide dimensions, the only of such kind in the entire portion of the central Himalayas. It is washed by numerous rivulets with sources in the north and, though generally enjoying cold climate, is sufficiently vegetated. The mid country consists of black soil and alluvium and the earth of the region in its entirety is such as to make for a very durable and strong type of bricks. Consequently, stone had been totally out of use for buildings of any kind, and its place was taken by bricks, just as it was in Huang valley of ancient China. This is perhaps a novel feature to be found of an ancient community on this side of the Himalayas.

All these played an important part in determining the demography of the area. Not only the valley of Kathmandu came to occupy an important place as a peopled area having attracted migration at a very early age of history, but it was repeatedly subjected to visitation by emigrant hordes, which of course produced its repercussions in shaping the synthetic culture of the area at every phase of its development.

The immigration has been proportionately of a corresponding nature drawing its due from all directions. It is, however, possible that only the most adventurous of the migrants must have penetrated in the beginning. The outlet of the river Bagmati was probably the entrance, and to the south goes the credit of allowing the passage for the earliest settlers. But the earliest settlers were not those who belonged to Aryavarta. As we will observe later on in this book the people first settling down in the valley belonged to the Tibeto-Burman stock and to the section of them who had expanded in the north east of India after being pressed by calamities at home. The process had been thus: the hilly interior of the Terai could readily absorb the migrating hordes, when some of them were pushed further west from Assam hills and again from there they seem to have travelled upwards to the source of the R. Bagmati.

Geological formation of the valley points to a stage of its existence totally submerged under water. The hillocks interspersing the valley at places were the only portions not exactly in that condition. The valley otherwise happened to be the bed of the lake now dried up. This accounts for the rich fertility of the soil, which nurtures several crops within twelve months of the year. The Nepalese culture evolved and advanced mainly through the topography and soil formation thus outlined. But for the cut provided by the river Bagmati's gorge, Nepal would also not come under superior cultural influences, which seem to have worked without much of physical contact. There has been not a single case of large scale migration from the western India, the seat of culture at the time of our history. No doubt, we find a few Indian families of rulers and their entourage in the scene which exerted a very powerful cultural influence but did not modify in any way the racial type of local inhabitants. Probably it was mainly due to the

very meagre blood contact of the early inhabitants of Nepal with the Aryan stock of the plains, that the principal feature of the facial expression of the original stock of the Nepalese remains distinctly Mongoloid.

The valley reached an advanced stage of urban culture from a very long time. Its base was peasant economy like that of any other oriental culture, and the progress was retarded by social conflicts and by feudal forces resisting changes in the economy. And it was a prototype of ancient Indian culture with slight variation which Nepal in that course brought out. The valley of Nepal was by nature very much favoured. It was free from very many natural calamities, floods, drought, etc., and though winter was too cold it had a pleasant and working spring and summer. In the circumstances it could enjoy a surplus of production. It was in the nature of the Ganges basin economy that the development took place. Consequently, a culture of aristocracy was born; fine art, sculpture, etc. flourished triumphantly. But these bear the imprint of Indian influence, as from the southern side all cultural inroads were made when the invaders imposed their own polity and regime on the Nepalese. It seems that Nepal while assimilating all race influences in its own way yielded to some aspects of Indian culture to incorporate the same in its broad outline. Also one has to remember that contact with India was direct and regular as much as it could be with the facilities offered by nature. The country was practically shut in the north for all sorts of contacts till early 7th century A. D.

The cultural tradition of Nepal, however, has its own peculiarities. Even if it has indelible impression of the Indian culture, it retained the original of the Mongoloid culture intact. This was at a later date supplemented by cultural contacts with Tibet and China to assimilate their very late cultural developments. Thus at a late period of history the culture of the Nepal valley had come to resemble to a certain extent partly the Chinese and partly the Indian cultural tradition of the early age though essentially it was the latter which has the largest influence. But combining the two the Nepalese culture developed its own features. And let it be understood that by Nepalese culture we mean the one nourished in the valley of Kathmandu. As till a very late period of history other tribes do not come into the picture, we also omit all the people except the Newars from the context.

In our delineation of the customs and manners of the Newars of Kathmandu we have in detail described the main features of this culture. We have not beer able to give the date for the first settlement in the valley. Archaelogical investigation is practically not done. Nepal's pre-history is, therefore, a matter of a convenient guess work. It is not even known whether the earliest immigrants entered the valley in a state of pastoral life. But some customs can be identified with those of the tribes in the farthest east of India. Possibly when they settled down in the valley, they were comparatively an advanced community. They manufactured certain pots of ornamented design by using a wheel and worked on copper and bronze. They had also developed a taste for wood carving and metal works. The black soil obtained in Nepal might have enabled them to develop a high style of pottery. Their agricultural instruments were spade of a large size and wooden earth breaker, but they did not use bullocks for ploughing. The absence of a method of ploughing by bullocks is attributed to the discovery of the early age that the soil penetrated deeper, and this could be only done by a spade, bore fitness for multi seasonal crops or they might have continued the hoe cultur of the northeast region and later on found that ploughing fully served the purpose. Other artifacts are not known. Amongst the domesticated animals the buffalo immediately comes to our notice, and the inhabitants took its milk as well as consumed its flesh. The foodgrains consisted of wheat, rice and maize, and fowls and ducks formed the birds domiciled by the mankind.

If the chronicles were to be believed, the class coming into being after a process of separation from the general population saw its light as soon as the migrating hordes from the Indian plains arrived. These came with an aristocratic culture with knowledge, instruments and better skill of warfare and even after mixing with the local populace gradually drifted to form a separate ruling class much probably with the help of the indigenous aristocracy with whom they mixed freely and intermarried. The cultural inroad from India seems also to have been accompanied by political influence, which sometime afrer was responsible for the setting of a class in a community hitherto tribal and free from class domination.

Bullock carts were not in use, nor any other conveyance driven by beasts of burden is traced out. For transport the inhabitants had made a peculiar artifact called *Khamu* still in use by the peasants consisting of two baskets tied in a swinging fashion bilaterally to a bamboo pole which rested on the two shoulders of the man carrying the same. Such a type of a basket like thing was to be found in China as well. But in the whole of Nepal it obtains in the valley only. Horses and elephants did not exist during the earliest phase of Nepalese culture.

The Kirati culture was the primitive culture of the area. It was followed by the Mauryan. It introduced new forms. Horses and elephants then made first appearance but they would not be acclamatised and they appeared along with the Mauyan expedition and probably because the Mauryas in the plains used these animals for transport services, and they carried the use to Nepal. For the structure of the building the reader is requested to see the following article in this volume on art and architecture. One does not know when they ceased to burn their dead. About the dress it can be said that it answered to the description of the T'ang history (vide below). This must be the correct manner of dressing for we know the type of a cover as outlined in that text for upper body is still prevalent in some portions of Nepal, and more specially amongst the primitive Kiratas and also the Gurungs and Magars. Urban centres have not been traced for the period beyond the 4th century B.C.

The state of Nepal was originally a republic and possibly ruled by tribal heads with the help of customary laws. It was, however, a settled community which we encounter as far as habitation in the valley comes to our mind, even the earliest of them seem to have been stabilised. The very original settlers as soon as they entered the valley seem to have shaken off their nomadic habits. This was what the situation of the valley determined. It provided a ground for a settled agriculture and surplus production for the commercial class of the urban areas. In that process Nepal's early civilization came also to be associated with the republican structure of Vaishali dominated by a cultured aristocracy without a ruling monarch. The same aristocracy was destined to become the ruling group when later on monarchy was introduced.

We are yet ignorant of the superstition and religious beliefs of the pre-historic Nepalese. From the earliest times the Nepalese imbibed Buddhism. But it is not to be supposed that the Nepalese cultural tradition had no roots in the soil of Nepal. Much it imbibed from the materials as they existed in the valley and also developed along a course determined by the isolated character of the region, and we find some original features still persisting to confirm our conclusion. Even the Buddhist principles of life had come to be adopted much modified by influences of the local environment. As common to all the people of Neolithic cultures, the Nepalese primitive also built his beliefs on magical rites performed to enhance and maintain the fertility of the soil and protection of the crops from the ravages of nature over which he had no control. All elements of nature were regarded as spirits beneficent or evil working so as to affect man's destiny and life and sacrifices including those of human beings were offered to propitiate them. It seems that what the legends convey is more or less correct and this cannot be incorrect because the practice we refer to i. e. the sacrifice of human beings, continued as late as the beginning of the present century in some shrines inside the Nepal valley. The Nepalese also believed in an elaborate ritualism accompanying the funeral of the dead to ward off the possibility of its taking demoniac existence likely to haunt the area and it was also seen that the death took place inside the house premises. Female deities were regarded more important than the male ones, and this is also a peculiarity of the Neolithic Nepalese culture.

We know nothing about the primitive art, early mode of depicting images have not come to light. As for the writing of the period, the earliest script known happens to be Kharosthi (Ashoka pillar inscription) but this is not available for the Nepal valley. How far the script affected the course of cultural development cannot be exactly said. Probably writing began along with the advent of the Aryan aristocratic block, may be in the 4th century A.D., from India and formed the special field of these people. That is why the local dialect, Newari, would not come up to the level of a language of a literature. This state is also mainly responsible for the total absence of records delineating cultural tradition of the age.

This is all for an introduction of the history of ancient and medieval Nepal. We have certainly introduced a pre-historic material to the general narrative of events of the historical period but this was very essential as without this particular item the beginning of the history of Nepal would not be clearly presented. The cultural tradition of Nepal as it existed at the time has thus been aptly described. For the development of the periods following Nepal's prehistory the reader is referred to the chapters forming the main portion of the book.

THE ANTIQUITY OF THE NEWARS OF KATHMANDU

The prevailing idea of the time in regard to the origin and antiquity of this people has been to consider them as only a late comer in the arena of the valley of Kathmandu, despite the fundamental traits in ethnic and cultural sphere which they exhibit to contravene such a conception. The purpose of the present discourse is to show that the Newars existed as early as the sixth century B. C. and that they belonged to the confederacy of the Vrijji clans.

The Kiratas and the Newars

It is admitted by all that the Kiratas were the sole occupants of the valley for a long time, from the earliest time ever recorded in history. The same is said of the Newars, and is claimed by them and lent support by various ethnic and anthropological findings. But whereas the former, the Kiratas, have to their support the evidence of the chronicles further confirmed by the Puranas, the Newars have not come up for any sort of mention in the above-mentioned treatises, though curiously they happen to be the people to have been closely associated with all what the country has stood for, its name and fame and its grandeur and brilliance. Nobody can deny the very ancient association of this people with the valley. We have definite linguistic and archaeological proofs for the existence of this people as early as the fifth century A. D. by a reference to the Newari names in the inscriptions, which are maintained intact up till today. The various names like Gum Vihara (Levi III, 74) Tegwalnarayan (I. A, IX, p. 168), Buga yumi (*ibid.* p. 169) and Thambugangulamula (*ibid*, 171) are pure Newari derivatives. The language of the inscriptions being Sanskrit, it may be inferred that Newari was then thrown into background as up till now it is. Due to the preference of the Lichhavi Kings under Gupta influence or even before and also, as a language of the cultured few, Buddhists or Shaivites, Sanskrit was the medium adopted in the court. But under no circumstances it had ousted Newari as a language of the mass of people who read and wrote in their common dialect. The priority of the Newars over the Lichhavis in

matter of dates is quite obvious and we can doubtlessly assume that the Newars were inhabiting the valley long before the Lichhavis stepped there.

The Vamshavalis write that the Kiratas were conquered by the Lichhavis. Are they the people speaking the Newari dialect ?

This is the moot point of the present discourse. The *Kiratas* today occupy a region cut off by huge undemarcated forests and mountain ranges from the rest of the country and from the Newars of the valley of Kathmandu. The question is whether they migrated wholesale in this region after their defeat or stayed on despite. To an ordinary mind the idea of a wholesale migration involving the summary removal of hearth and home from a place where the settlement is of thousand years is inconceivable. No conquest or repression can dislodge them. The same may be said of the *Kiratas* who when subjugated by the Lichhavis must be taken to have confined themselves to the valley. We must also note that the *Kiratas* are placed, according to *manusmriti*, in the position and status equal to the Lichhavis, which shows their distinguished place at that time. Now if the fact of civilisation were to be brought to bear on this problem, the *Kiratas* on no account can come up to the level of the Newars who have to their credit a very ancient and rich culture, while they themselves have been steeped in age-long darkness and ignorance. Curiously enough, therefore the Newars seem to approach the description assigned so long to the old *Kiratas*. There is yet another point in favour of the Newars. The chronicles and the *Puranas* assert that *Kiratadesha* was in touch with the *Madhyadesha* from a very long time. If this is the case, the influence of Sanskrit would not have been so rare in the *Kirati* language as is not the case with Newari which betrays profound influence of Sanskrit in its vocabulary.

The penetration of Mauryan influence in Nepal is another point connected with the problem. Although of late, it has been subjected to doubts by scholars, we have sufficient ground to believe the entry of *Ashoka* into the valley; at least, there is no reason to minimise its influence on Nepal of the contemporary period. We have *Ashoka's* pillar not only in *Rupamdehi* and *Nilgriba*, but also some on the bank of the River Bagmati in the Nepalese Terai, appearing like a chain of links

between Magadha and Nepal, through which *Ashoka* might have traversed The stupas in the valley resemble very clearly those in the plains, in *Sarnath* or elsewhere and by no stretch of imagination they can be attributed to other persons or times. The fact that the modern *Kiratas* do not betray the least sign of eastern Buddhism must mean that they were not the people to come under its influence at a very early age. We cannot take them as representatives of the people inhabiting the valley 2300 years ago, who were definitely Buddhists. They probably are not the people meant in reference to the *Kiratas* of that time by the *Vamshavalis*, though distantly they may have ethnic identity with the other group who later became known as Newars.

We now come to the old thesis that the Newars were the people to come under the first influence of Buddhism and this they retained in conjunction with the Lichhavis for a long time. The language factor may stand in the way of proper identification between the Newars and the *Kiratas*, but on proper analysis it appears that Newari is not entirely unconnected with modern *Kirati* both having various features of resemblance. The dissimilarity in physical features might be explained with reference to the age-long isolation both sustained in course of the past three or four thousand years or to some type of interfusion with the primitive dwellers both underwent during this long span of years.

The legend in the same way may support the identification of the Newars with the old *Kiratas*. It is commonly believed that the first ruling dynasty in the valley was that of the *Kiratas*. This must be an allusion to the first settlement and humanisation of the valley by a stock of the *Kiratas* whose identity with the Newars we have just traced. There are circumstances which definitely go to show that the Newars were not the same as the Lichhavis. No one will admit that the language spoken by the Lichhavis was of the nature of modern Newari. The very currency of a group of languages, non-Aryan and unrelated to those spoken in the plains, in the Himalayas and laterly the adoption of Sanskrit attributed mainly to Indo-Aryan influence have supplied proofs against identifying the Newars with the Lichhavis, though culturally they might have allied features. The assertion of the *Vamshavalis* that the Malla rulers were Newars similarly seems to be not only wrong but

contradictory in view of their admission that the Mallas were emigrants from the plains, whereas the Newars are the original settlers of the valley. The Newars must be identified with the old *Kirata* settlers to explain their hoary past. It may be observed here that in ancient treatises everybody living in the Himalayas was called a *Kirata*.

First Settlement in the valley.

From a deep anthropological study it has been gathered that many of the tribes now inhabiting the hilly regions of Assam and Bengal belong to one race and all of them had migrated to this region in the sixth or seventh century B. C. This swarm of migration is quite unrelated to the Pre-Dravidian race of India, for the *Kiraas* as also the Assamese and Newars, while agreeing in their own main features and manners, differ fundamentally from the Negroid element which is given a priori the foremost antiquity in Indian settlement. The Pre-Dravidian or Dravidian is definitely a non-Mongolian stock, with curly hair, swarthy complexion and tall and slender stature. The *Kiratas* are a fair people flat cheeked with long cheek bones, short nose and scanty beards and also with small black eyes and short stature—all obvious characteristics of Mongoloid origin. The attempt, therefore, to connect South India with the Newars must be discarded inasmuch as the affinity they bear to tne Mongoloid race of the north-eastern India is too apparent to lend colour to any attempt of approximation by conjectures with other races. An inspection of the physical feature of a Newar will reveal in sufficient manner his close affinity with the tribes of North Eastern India, so that the same period of migration must be taken to have brought the Newars to the valley of Kathmandu. Another people who possess striking resemblance with the Newars now inhabiting the base regions of the lower Himalayas are the Tharus who have, however, totally submitted to Hindu culture as to merge in it.

Why they were called Newars ?

There is no doubt that the Newars are the only people to have been closely associated with the origin of the word Nepal, the name of the country, either in prospective or retrospective way. The word Nepal occurs, for the first time in Indian literature in the work of *Kautilya* who

writes of certain blankets made in that country. As to the origin of the word, various speculations have been suggested, the most absurd of which is to connect it with an imaginary sage, called Nemuni whose existence save by the fantastic assertion of the Chronicles has not yet been traced out. Sylvan Levi has cited another authority to have enunciated the origin by attributing the derivative to the name of the *Ashoka* tree which is called *Ne* in Nepal. The only trustworthy conclusion, however, seems, to refer the word to *Kirati* vocabulary. According to the north-eastern interpretation, *Nepa,* they do not pronounce *la*, is a name applied to the country occupying the central portion of the Himalayas, which fits in with the geographical position of the country as covering just the central part of the great mountain. *Newar* is another form of expression to derote the inhabitants of *Nepal, ra* and *la*, not sounding in pronunciation to have assumed the changed form which betrays only a slight alteration probably on account of a long usage. At any rate, the close association may incidentally produce an evidence for the antiquity of the Newars prior to the time of *Kautilya* whose utterance indirectly supports the existence of the Newars in the valley before his time. The chronicle alone persistently calls that period as one of *The Kiratis* under a wrong notion that the Newars came from South India late in the ninth century A. D.

The Newars and the Lichhavis

Much ink has flown on the question whether the Lichhavis are Aryans or non-Aryan Mongoloids[1]. Dr. Jayaswal (pp. 171-84, Hindu Polity) and Prof. Ray Chaudhuri (Political History, pp 103-05) have produced lengthy arguments to show that they were Aryans. The arguments may not be repeated here, but may be briefly dealt as follows :—

(1) That the Lichhavis had entered into a confederacy with the Aryan settlers like the Videhas and the Mallas.

(2) That the *Ramayana* and many other Sanskrit texts connect their rulers with the main stock of the Vedic *Ksatriyas.*

1 B. C. Law, Some *Ksatriya* Tribes in India, pp 26-29; Modern Review, 1919, p 50 ; Watters, ii p 83,s; The Book of Kindred saying, *Samyutta nikaya* by Mrs. Rhys Davids, pp 257-89, Rockhill's Life of Buddha, pp 62-63; IA, 1908 (Smith's article) : EH, p 155 (3rd edition) ; Beal's Romantic Legend of Sakyamuni. pp 158-60.

(3) That they were regarded as *Vratyas* because they did not subscribe to Brahmanical rules of life.

(4) That the *Mahaparinibbana* Sutta makes the Lichhavis claim a portion of Buddha's relic on the ground of their *Ksatriya* lineage.

Against these contentions the following are offered :—

(1) That the mere fact of confederacy with the Aryan tribes may not be in itself an evidence for Aryan lineage of a confederate member.

(2) That, moreover, the confederacy came to be established only when monarchy in Videha had ceased to function, which also weakens the argument of the dynastic analogy of rulers, as in the same period the same *Ksatriya* dynasty if there was any, had followed suit of their Videhan contemporaries.

(3) That so long as the seat of the confederacy was at Vaishali, they were known as Vrijjis under the name of the Greater Member and immediately when there was dissolution of the confederacy, only the separate designation was retained and that perhaps this explains the reticence of the *Panini* (in IV, 2131) about the Lichhavis and their subsequent comment at the hands of *Kautilya.*

(4) That they were regarded as *Vratyas* not merely because they were Buddhists but also for their queer social customs like endogamy, chaitya worship, etc.

(5) That as many other non-Aryan tribes also had demanded relic of Buddha, the ground for calling the Lichhavis *Ksatriyas* on that account alone is most unsatisfactory.

It would appear that a single instance of any evidence is no final proof in support of the argument. The above will show how the mere sharing of Buddha's relic was no factor to determine the Aryan origin of the Lichhavis as there were also people of non-Aryan stock sharing it. Similarly Manu's statement must not be taken without reserve, firstly because he has placed the Lichhavis with Khasas and Dravidas, the latter definitely non-Aryan and secondly because he says that these people and certain others like the Kiratas had deviated

from their original position owing to their non-Brahmanical beliefs[1]. Vratya may mean impure or barbarous or anything worse without even denoting the sense of deviation from a high rank, but the fact that confirmed Non-Aryans like the Dravidas and Kiratas were deemed as Ksatriyas shows how elastic is the classification of Manu. It shows how social infiltration amongst all sections of people had taken place as to imbibe definitely foreign blood at the time when Manu wrote his treatise. Just as Buddha is claimed as one of the ten incarnations of Visnu the various powerful tribes—Pre-Aryans or non-Aryans, Dravidas or Mongols, were included in the family of Ksatriyas. By Vratya or "Vrsala Ksatriya" no sense short of non-Brahmanical beliefs is implied, whether it be a case of deviation or a case of traditional non-Aryan observances. Manu simply stresses the original position of these people who, he says, were the Ksatriyas now degraded into filthy life. He does not, however, make a distinction between the Aryans and Dravids and between Aryans and Mongols, which destroys the attempt to base the origin of the Lichhavis to Aryan Ksatriya stock on his admission.

No definite proof exists as to the Mongolian origin of the Lichhavis the so-called points of resemblance being rightly declared incomplete as conclusions on this subject. But Manu's branding the Lichhavis as 'Vratya' must have some significance and when we see that in that class he puts the non-Aryans and Aryans alike, the treatment the Lichhavis received at his hands is obvious and distinctly confusing the issue of their real origin, which we have just noted. The Vratyas ordinarily were a despised people. They required a rigid kind of ceremony to go through to come to the other fold (Katyayana's Srauta Sutra). They had to renounce their old affiliations and past after being sworn in the new

(F. n,) १ झल्लो मल्लश्च राजन्याद्व्रात्यान् निच्छिविरेवच ।
नटश्च करणश्चैव खसो द्रविड एव च । २२ ।
शनकैस्तु क्रियालोपादिभ: क्षत्रियजातय :
वृषलत्वं गता लोके ब्राह्मण दर्शनेनच । ४३ ।
पौन्ड्रकाश्चौड्रद्रविडा : काम्बोजा यवना : शका : ।
पारदा : पह्लवाश्चीना : किराता दरदा : खसाः । ४४ । Manu X,

mode of living. There is nothing like extraordinary in this as applied to Lichhavis. *Katyayana* or anybody else had no hesitation to extend the same to *Chinas* and *Kiratas*, and Khasas and Dravidas. Wherein is the proof that Manu's statement implies the Aryan lineage of the Lichhavis? In fact there is none.

There may be a partial truth in the statement that a body of foreigners who were unfriendly towards the *Brahmans* could hardly have been accepted as *Ksatriyas*. But what explanation is there to justify the admission of the hostile tribes like the Khasas and *Kiratas* into the *Ksatriya* community? The legend contained in the *Paramathha Jotika* as to the origin of the Lichhavis from a queen of *Kashi* may be compared to similar legend of the *Kiratas*, by which they claim their descent from *Kashi Ksatriyas*. This is due to the common tendency amongst the people of India to try to show themselves to have descended from a *Ksatriya* stock of *Kashi*.

That the Lichhavis were a late comer in the comity of independent peoples is shown by the omission of the Lichhavi republic in the Brahmanical list. Perhays this may be due to the predominance of the Videha rulers in those areas, for as soon as Videhan monarchy dies the Lichhavis figure as independent, and this fact has found expression in *Kautilya's* treatise.

What is gathered from the above discussion is the close affirity of the Newar community with the Vrijji republic, of which there were as many non-Aryan members, a position, which cannot be dismissed as inadmissible on the ground that they were Mongols, or despised as such in the ancient texts. We know from *Kautilya* that they were existing in his time and though he is reticent as to their political structure or their connection as such, he has nevertheless located all the eight members of the Vrjji *Gana* in the vicinity of the central Himalayas, so that the probability of the Newars to have been one of them is not far inasmuch as many of the confederates still remain to be unidentified. Hedged in all sides by the *Vrjji* clans, the Newars would not have maintained isolation or been allowed to do so on any other consideration.

Any one conversant with the social structure of the Newars would believe that the Newars were originally a democratic Buddhist people, casteless and kingless. They still exhibit traces of old features. They have no untouchables amongst them—it is admitted that whoever *there are* came mainly from outside and that also within comparatively recent times. They have no class corresponding to Brahmans, the former monks now having left monasteries performing this function on the blind influence of the Tantric and Shaivaite doctrines. At the same time the old titles, even formally, of the monks, like *Sakyabhiksu, Vajracharya*, etc., which are more indicative of the original casteless nature of the society are retained. In such circumstances no feasibility of a monarchical form of Government, a prototype of one man's rule, was least entertained. The word *Juju* used for the King at present expresses a sense of mere nodding apparatus without any power or executive prerogatives, for *Ju* in Newari means an expression of approval revealed in the nodding of head. The Newars probably believed in the *Sangha* deliberation as in *Vaishali.* It is really unique that an originally turbulent people had disciplined themselves as Buddhists and democrats and had undergone a change in their social behavior to live with the most progressive sections like the Videhas and the Lichhavis.

We have three more pieces of evidence to support the view that the Newars were included in the *Vrijji* clans. The first is that they still retain the usual designation of *Vrjji.* The lower class people mostly the untouchables, who reveal definite racial type of feature of Dravids or Pre-Dravids, call the Newar as Vajje, which is peculiarly used to them alone in the most respectful sense. The second and third are the Chaitya worship and the *Yaksa* superstition. As these two features of the Newari social life are still preserved, our task is rendered easier in the matter of comparison. We should observe here that these were present in *Vaishali* also. The Chaitya is the oldest form of place for worship. During Ashoka's entry into Nepal, there were many Chaityas and it was probably due to the influence the Newars derived from the common culture which they shared with the Lichhavis. The *Yaksa* is now called *Khya.* There is a belief in Nepal that the devil, called *Khya,* is endowed with the capacity of bestowing on his

favourite whatever amount of money the latter desires to possess. His picture with two big jugs holding money appears along with that of *Laksmi*, the Goddess of wealth. The devil is still offered sacrifices. One does not know whether the *Yaksa* or *Khya* is a superstition mainly belonging to and originating in Non-Aryan people. Kuvera is certainly an Aryan demi-god who figures commonly in the *Ramayana* and *Mahabharata*. He is given the royal position in the Himalayas and as such his association with the Aryan people is close. If he is not racially connected, he has at least a tie of culture with them. Nor the idea of ugliness is intended with reference to the Himalayan people as seems to be the conclusion of Dr. Jayaswal, while he attributes the snubnosed relief images of Sanchi and Bharuth to the social types identified with the *Kiratas*. The very romance about the *Yaksa* as appears in our poetic literature must dispel such ideas. Like V. Smith, K. P. Jayaswal also bases his reading on the alleged ugliness of the Northern dwellers. They were, however, not coarse and ugly. We have a Chinese account on the subject (Levi, I, 157—61) which has spoken highly of the beauty of the valley of Kathmandu. It was no ordinary complement as it comes from one of the acknowledged beautiful races of the world like the Chinese. Whatever that may be, we have to bear in mind that the *Yaksa* is only a superstition and no idea of racial affinity from relief images can be obtained or adduced for purposes of any sort of identification. The only argument it offers is the close cultural collaboration between the peoples of Nepal and *Vaishali*, who as Newars and Lichhavis were existing as early as the sixth century B. C.

---

(2)

THE NEWARS OF KATHMANDU

One of the most ancient tribes, which has made itself famous by a deep, varied and voluminous contribution to the cultural heritage of man is the semi-civilized Newar tribe of Nepal. Very obscure in origin, possessing a peculiar culture mixed with many tribal crudities, the Newar tribe constitute a most complicated problem. The Newars form the oldest living group, not only in Nepal but in the whole of India. Their civilization goes back to a period older than Mohenjodaro. Their contribution to the particular variety of Asian art and architecture, popularly known as Indo-Tibetan, is very profound. They gave Nepal a name and fame without which that mountainous country would have been unknown. No wonder, therefore, that such a tribe has attracted the attention of historians and Indologists.

The Newars have been living in the valley of Katmandu for centuries; nobody knows when they first settled down. If the *Mahabharata* and other Sanskrit works were to be relied on and if it can be proved that the reference therein about Nepal implied reference to Kathmandu, the presence of the Newars in the valley even in that period cannot be doubted. From the time of the *Mahabharata* to the time of the Lichchavis whose entry into this mountain principality opened a new vista for historians, the Newars seem to have been known by a different name. This only can explain the absence of any mention about these people in the books and anecdotes of that time. It is also very difficult to surmise how this word came into use. Even after the Lichchavis, there is nothing to shed light on this point. Nepal gets its name from Naimeni, according to legends, but if its antiquity were to be established as early as the *Mahabharata*, Naimeni, or whatever be the name of the name giver, cannot belong to the third or fourth century A. D. Some historians erred in attributing the name, Nepal, to a king named Nimishi who flourished in the third century A. D. What seems to be nearer to fact is that this king created the word 'Newar' by a dexterous combination of his name along with Nepal(?). Nepal could become

Newar after some time by a process by which similar other words undergo a change ; Nepal, Nepara, Newara. It is, therefore, entirely absurd to think that the Newars are the same people as the Nairs of Malabar or that they were immigrants from North-Western India. There is still a legend in Nepal that the Newars came from the plains. These legends, however, are not entirely false, but they seem to have misconstrued certain important facts. The Newars did not come from the plains but certain families from the plains, such as the Lichchavis of Vaishali and Mallas of Pawapuri, have been absorbed in the Newar tribe and very likely legends speak of these families, when they link the plains with the Newars of Kathmandu. And Nepalese culture was such as assimilated all other cultures and tribes. These are matters, however, to be decided by historians ; I have merely hinted at them. We can only say with assurance and beyond any doubt that the Newars are a very old people.

It should be noted that the Newari culture assimilated settlers from outside as late as the thirteenth century A. D. In this particular century alone, certain immigrant families from Mithila and Bengal were absorbed in Kathmandu. The Devabhajus, who are most probably from Bengal and who are responsible for the revival of Sanatani Hindu religion in Nepal in the reign of the Mallas, have lost their Bengali character and have been absorbed with the Newars in all aspects of life. They have been, however, able to preserve their caste individuality by a rigid isolation in matrimonial affairs. The Jhas from Mithila who migrated during the invasion of Sultan Shamsuddin of Bengal have also suffered a change towards absorption in the Newari mode of life. But whereas the Devabhajus were completely absorbed and have become part and parcel of the Newari communal life, by assuming the priestly function of the Shaiva section of the Newars, the Jhas have still dealings with their brethren in Mithila. They have marriage relations outside and are still regarded as Maithils, but that the Devabhajus are from Bengal no Newar believes, and this shows how closely united they are at present.[1]

1. The total population of the Newars may be roughly a million and the area over with they have spread is roughly 18×22 sq. miles.

ORIGIN

The origin of this tribe is little known outside or inside the city of Kathmandu. Certain people have attempted to unravel this origin but in vain. The greatest mistake has come from hurried generalisation without a study of Newari physiognomy.

It cannot be established that the Newars are Mongolian or Aryan people or that they came from Tibet or India. While there is much to lend colour to their Mongolian origin, Tibet cannot be set up as the homeland of the Newars. The confusion in this direction is due to the absence of any documents and relevant local legends. We have only to take recourse to anthropological study to arrive at a correct estimate of things. If we analyse the Newar facial expression, the Mongol origin is found indelibly imprinted in it. But the Newars bear affinity more to the tribes of the North-Eastern India than to the Tibetans. I have seen the Assam hill-tribes and also the Manipuris; and the Rajabansis of Purnea and Jalpaigarhi on close scrutiny I could not note any difference in features. So if the Newars came from anywhere, it is more probable that they came from the North Eastern India at a period when the tribe in that region expanded all over India(?). Very lately, some historians have told us that the Kols and Bhils who represent the oldest type of Indian civilization belong to this group and also that they embarked on their migratory career in the same period. The Newar tribe is an offshoot of that expansive race.

Not all Newars are of this type, and there is a smaller section of them owing allegiance to the Aryan race. As we have already referred to them, these are the descendants of the Lichchavis and the Mallas. This section has also imbibed certain Mongol characteristics, but it is by way of admixture with the original settlers; in return they have transfused Aryan blood in some Mongolian families. This section has prominent Aryan features. But manners and language are proof of their affinity, though of late mixing has practically ceased.

There is, however, no watertight barrier between these two sections. Certain names amongst the castes and sub-castes bear testimony to an

Indian origin; for example, some families have still the Malla appendage in their family titles: others, however, have been completely submerged.

RELIGION

Nowhere does a complete harmony prevail between divergent forms of worship as in the valley of Kathmandu. It is as if all sections understood the significance of this basic unity of all shades of belief. There are no Mohammedans amongst the Newars. But Buddhists and Hindus have been living together in perfect harmony throughout the ages. And to the surprise of all, it is only in the valley of Kathmandu that a complete harmony of worships has been possible and instances of hostile camps coming together in the temple are pretty common. A Sanatani Hindu Newar pays as much respect to his own deity as to the deity of the other sect and *vice versa*. All temples in Nepal have removed the taint of segregation. Taken as such the Newars may appear neither wholly Buddhists nor wholly Hindus. They have been able to eliminate all discord from their social life and to maintain amity and concord between themselves. This is an example which should draw the attention of the diehard communalists in India.

The harmonious adjustment in the field of religion can be traced to the trend of historical development. The Newars have always been subjected to invasions from outside both culturally and politically and Kathmandu has been visited by all kinds of reformers. The tradition of teaching dissimilar dogmas is too indelible to be brushed off. And today this has led to a mixed form of worship where a perfect type of communal understanding prevails.

Yet a stronger factor has been the effort of the Tantrists who have welcomed devotees irrespective of caste and creed. The Tantric influence in Kathmandu has not been a force of discrimination and isolation. It is all embracing and pervasive. Thus almost all temples have come to adopt the mode of worship in accordance with the Tantric system.[1] People of all castes, not excepting the untouchables, and of all creeds, in-

1. The deities like the Tara of Sankhu. Mahankal of the Parade, the Dakshina Kali—all in the valley, have commanded the respect of all. Only Pashupatinath has not.

cluding the Shaivite Hindu Newars, have tenaciously revered the Tantric rules. And in return they have been granted equality of rights to worship in the temples, sometimes even in the face of deep seated caste prejudices. It would be a matter of extreme satisfaction to Indian social reformers to learn that for hundreds of years the untouchables in the happy valley of Kathmandu have been enjoying the right of entry into the temples and that in some cases they are installed as temple worshippers. All that is due to the sole influence of the Tantras.

Of course Tantrism is not an unmixed blessing. Tantrism has in some respects vitiated the simplicity and beauty of Newari life. It has brought about very wild forms of violence and cruelty in sacrifice; one of the most cruel modes of sacrifice requires fresh blood from the throat of a living buffalo. The throat is gradually pierced with a dagger so that the blood flows slowly over the image of the deity, while at the same time the buffalo in extreme agony is kept alive till the last drop of blood leaves the body. The Tantric mode of worship and sacrifice is at the root of this. Again much of the undesirable complexity and rigidity now dominant in the religious life of the Newars is due to the Tantras. The Mudra formations and some other quaint actions seem all nonsensical formalities, but they have to be followed strictly in matters of worship. Devil dancing is also a part of the ceremony and masked heads when in worship are a common sight in Newari festivals. Medievalism in worship as in many other aspects of their life has come as a blot in contrast with the artistic and cultural achievements of the Newars. Considering that whatever is incongruous there, is partly due to the Tantric distortion, the blame falling on the Tantric Pandits should be great. But even then the other side of the problem cannot be dismissed. That Tantric influence has tended to unify opposite religious forces should not be dismissed without further thought; and it should not be forgotten that, with all its regrettable results, Tantrism has given a special distinction to the religion of the Newars who hardly find a place among the Buddhists of other countries. Tantrism has taken them nearer to Tibet.

NEWARI FESTIVALS

The Newars celebrate all Shaivite festivals, but they have their own

special festivals celebrated in accordance with the Tantras. Of all peoples the Newars have the greatest number of festivals. At one time or other, each fortnight or week, they have festivities accompanied by the most splendid display of ceremonial rites and observances. The home of a Newar always wears a festive appearance and not a single day passes without some pomp or ceremony or without old style music and the ringing call of all sorts of medieval instruments and in an ecstacy brought about by overdoses of liquor. Each ceremony is marked with the offering of liquor bowls and sacrifices of buffaloes, liquor and meat being distributed to keep the devotees aglow with joy.

Devil dances are very common. Masks of demons and of gods and goddesses are worn by the dancers and symbolic dances involving artistic poise and movement are exhibited. These dances are full of meaning and are performed with delicacy and perfection. In addition to devil dances, certain other dances, mainly classical, accompany ceremonies, the chief dances being the *Mahakali*, the *Tara*, the harvest dance. Some of these dances retain realistic traits in them. One such dance, generally held along as a part of the eight day ceremony of *Indrajatra* which occurs in September, celebrates the fight of the God *Bhairab* with the buffalo demon; the special feature of this dance is that a living buffalo figures as one party to the battle. Sometimes a very ferocious buffalo has to be encountered by the dancing party symbolizing the Bhairab and his two menials, called Bhakkus in Newari, and it is not without strenuous efforts of hands and swords that the fight is ultimately decided against the demon; eventually the chief dancer who represents the Bhairab kills him with his sword. This dance is part of the nocturnal amusements provided in the *Indrajatra* and is witnessed and enjoyed by the Nepal nobility.

The Newars are a very superstitious people and, therefore, festivals involving rites and ceremonies designed to thwart the evil influence of the demons are very many. It is a common belief in the Kathmandu valley that demons are almost omnipresent. This is, of course, due to the prevailing influence of the Tantric cult. Ceremonies are still rigorously performed in pursuance of the above superstition. The *Shala Jatra* in March and the *Ghanta Karna* in August are held with all pomp

and splendour to drive away the invading devils. The belief is that discontinuance would have untoward results.

Festivals begin each year with *Baishakh.* The new month is the occasion of annual ceremonies in honour of the family deities. Goats and buffaloes are killed in great numbers. The Newars are buffalo eaters. This is also the occasion for a rendezvous of all the members of the family, as the ceremonies are held in congregation. Then there is *Sithinakh.* This time the nearest temple in the vicinity is the object of veneration. *Shaparu* or *Gaijatra* is celebrated for cow worship. Processions of decorated cows and bullocks are taken round the streets. The *Maghajatra* is the occasion for widely prevalent kirtans or songs of prayer. This festival occurs in January and is held for a month. Each *toli* or *Mahalla* individually celebrates this festival. Processions of devotees, singing the sacred name of Hari, are the chief features. During the *Bandejatra* the Priests go round the city and beg alms from their followers.

These festivals have come down from past ages and have been maintained intact without the least diminution in feeling. This, however, would not have been possible but for an institution which has alone fostered the tradition of the Newars. This institution, called the *Goothi,* is a veritable treasury for the Newars and it has endowed the Newari culture with the effective and necessary backing, the financial grants. It has been the custom of the Newars to reserve a certain portion of their property as sacred endowments for the upkeep of the family rites and observances. This endowment is not transferable or divisible. The family holds it jointly. Of late certain family feuds have afflicted this institution owing to the fast splitting up of the joint-family system; but that it has enabled the Newari family to keep up their tradition, nobody can deny. Moreover it provides maintenance for many families who get their income out of the joint property as part of their share. As the joint property is indivisible and unsaleable, the flow of income is uninterrupted. In this environment of fostering care and with full financial backing, the Newari medieval tradition could save itself from the forces of destruction.

CUSTOMS AND MANNERS

Some customs and manners have already been dealt with. Let us

take a few more of them. e. g. peculiarities in the marriage system. The Newari marriage ceremony is marked by the absence of the bridegroom in the proper rite, the bride alone performing all the rituals. There is no child marriage among them, but they have protected their women from perpetual widowhood by establishing the wifehood as something divine and permanent. The first ceremony towards marriage is performed as early as the sixth year of the girl and in the ceremony the girl is married with the *bel* (wood-apple) fruit. It is maintained that human relationship entered through marriage later on is a subsidiary and voidable contract; only the divine marriage is taken as indissoluble. The Newars allow widow marriage. Against the benefits conferred on women, however, should be considered certain social disadvantages attached to them. e. g. the Newars have a crude system of divorce but women have no choice in the matter. Another peculiar manner of the Newars is their adoption of the caste title of the mother in the event of cohabitation between two people of different castes. This appears like a matriarchal feature and is found in Newari society alone. The Newars have also enjoyed a thorough type of communal life and though the body of this life has been killed by the regime of autocracy, the spirit is preserved through annual gathering.

CASTE SYSTEM

It should be noted that the caste structure has been built upon the principles of non-violence and renunciation. This is noticeable in the names of the various castes, like Sakyavikhu, Vajracharya and Udasin, all connoting a sense of disgust with worldliness and temporal affairs. It is probable that the Newars had no caste system so long as they resisted outside pressure. But when that pressure came with cultural and political domination, the underlying high ideals succumbed except the name which has been kept up. The Newar castes at present are as much subject to mutual prejudices and ill-feelings as castes in India. There is a caste complex and a caste hierarchy. There is also a Priest class. If the Newars were to be classed as Buddhists, the caste system is peculiarly their own. There is however, a class immune from philosophical upheavals. This class of peasants, called *Jyapu*, has been all along a source of sustenance to the other three classes. It is not known whether

the old structure acknowledged their important position, but today they are downtrodden. There were no slaves amongst the Newars and there is no Kshatriya caste, both of which account for the peaceful character of the society. And let it be noted by the way, the Newar tribe was never aggressive and never dominated any other people, once it came to adopt Buddha's teachings. Also, the untouchables at Kathmandu have come from outside and though assimilated in the society have preserved a distinct feature. One proof is that even now there are no cobbler and untouchable goldsmith and blacksmith castes amongst the Newars. The absence of the Kshatriya caste prevented them from defending themselves and paved the way for constant domination by outsiders.

OCCUPATION

On the whole the Newars except the *Jyapus* are a people mainly adopting trade and commerce and crafts and industry as their profession. They have a monopoly over the whole of Nepal's commercial and industrial activities. Their position is duly acknowledged by the whole country and their name as *Bhaju* is a byword in Nepal—*Bhaju* means trader and is appended to the name of every Newar. The Newars, thanks to their wisdom and discretion and also skill and adaptability, have captured a position of vantage in the civil administration. Today they are at the top. At the same time, with dexterity and cunning they have protected their field from outside pressure. They have covered the whole country as traders, though they betray a lack of adventurous spirit. They are not taken in the army under the present regime.

LANGUAGE AND CULTURAL ACHIEVEMENTS

Linguistic and cultural development of the people of the Nepal valley has been singularly great. The Newari language and the Pagoda style of architecture stand as testimony to their greatness. To begin with the language, it is admitted that Newari reveals admirable characteristics of beauty and polish, of richness and refinement. It is one of the oldest languages of the world but even in its palmy days possessed little valuable treasury of high class literature. The language, however, has lived on and has shown a strong capacity to

resist outside influences. The cultural supremacy enjoyed by Sanskrit could alone affect it to some extent, but not so as to alter the linguistic structure. Literature, however, felt a rude shock at the hand of Shaivite culture and finally died.

The language of the Newars does not come into the category of Indian languages. It belongs to the Tibeto-Burman stock of Mongol origin. The monosyllabic nature of the words establishes its only connection with the above mentioned stock. It is, however, not admissible to deduce from this that Newari is an oft-shoot of Tibetan. Such inferences are not admissible in the light of deep research. A study of the two languages concerned has shown that behind the apparent unity as expressed in the monosyllabic nature of words there lies a fundamental disunity of meanings and idioms. More than 75 per cent of the words in Newari have no affinity with Tibetan, as will be proved by the following table, even if a few words are identical; it will appear that besides some identity between Tibetan and Newari, Sanskrit influence is also to a great extent manifest.

(1) *Newari*	*Tibetan*	*English*
Juju	Galpo	King
Nibha	Nga-mo	Sun
Jujuni	Chhimgmo	Queen
Shapu	Pechha	Book
Sha	Bhalang	Cow
Shin	Shin	Wood
Lha	Lha	Hand
Khwa	Khwa	Face
Mi	Mi	Fire

(2) *Newari*	*Sanskrit*	*English*
Nau	Nama	Name
Duru	Dugdhum	Milk
Manu	Manusya	Man
Ghyo	Ghrita	Ghee
Bhaye	Bhasa	Language

Nobody can deny the mutual influence of languages. If the Newars gave Tibet the Gupta script, which shows that Tibetan renaissance is of a later date, the talk of grave Tibetan influence might appear almost absurd. Let historians enlighten us!

In the matter of scripts, however, Sanskrit influence is very clear. The Newars took India's script and they have exhibited a tendency to admit all kinds of scripts, even Bengali and Maithili. A glance at the scripts of Gomu, Bhujimu, Ranja a and modern Newari will corroborate this view. Tibetan influence, on the other hand, is practically hidden beyond finding; only the monosyllabic nature of words may prove it, if proof it can be. In these scripts have been written many valuable works, now in the Nepal Library.

The Pagoda style of architecture is common to all Buddhistic countries. Much controversy existed as regards the origin of this style. But now it is admitted that the Pagoda style is Newari; temples constructed in this style existed in Nepal earlier than elsewhere. For a description of it one can view a picture of a Burmese Pagoda where each storey has got a roof of tiles—in Nepal metal sheets, and ths is a distinguishing feature—and where the main body of the temple looks like a tower of wide dimensions.

The Newars were great builders. A network of temples covers the three cities of the valley; Kathmandu itself is a city of temples. These temples have beautiful architectural and sculptural decorations and reveal a high standard of taste and refinement. The famous temples in Nepal are the Changunarayan (4th century A. D.), the Dattatreya, the Krishna, the Taleju and the Durbar Square temples.

The description of cultural achievements would not be complete without reference to the contribution made by the Newars to Tibetan culture which has followed Buddhist tradition since Buddhism had been introduced by the Nepalese in the 7th century A. D. The modelling of Tibetan script closely following the Gupta character is also a gift of the Newars; the valuable works of Sanskrit origin which found their way into Tibet and were written in Tibetan script greatly contributed to the Tibetan renaissance. The recent exploration and finds prove that

Tibet owes much to these books. They also establish the inalienable connection which existed between Tibetan and Indian cultures, the latter acting through the medium and agency of the Newars.

RELATION WITH INDIA

The valley of Kathmandu was never regarded as outside India's sphere of influence; all forces, cultural or political, seem to have affected it. Kathmandu did not stand in splendid isolation and at every period of history its relation with India has been intimate. As early as the *Mahabharata* days, the ruler of Nepal figures in the great fight: Buddhism entered Kathmandu at its very birth. The Maurya Princes and the Lichchavis were at the head of administration. Temporarily even the Kushans and the Guptas held sway over the country. Then there is the fact of Indian dynasties ruling in the valley; all ruling dynasties of Nepal—the Mauryas, the Lichchavis, the Thakuris, the Karnatakas the Mallas and the Shahs, were emigrants from the plains.

This, however, should not be misconstrued as to mean domination from India. Nepal's autonomy is traditional; this autonomy was respected by external rulers, even by the Guptas, and was scrupulously maintained by the ruling dynasties with a feeling of complete identity with the ruled. There is no truth, therefore, in the statement that the valley was a Hindu colony, owing allegiance to the mother country. If colony it was, it was fully independent and autonomous.

One point has to be stressed. This tiny valley of Kathmandu with 18×22 square miles of territory was the centre of all Nepalese activities and controlled the destiny of the whole mountainous kingdom. Even in ancient days the kingdom was reaching the present boundaries, though Nepal proper meant the valley only.

At present the Newars have lost much of their past glories and have entirely receded from arts and architecture. But in the midst of the medieval environment still persisting—in the many quaint customs and mannners, the Newars have much to interest the outside observers. And who can turn his eyes from the glorious temples and monuments vying with the best that man has created elsewhere? Kathmandu always tells the skill and artistic dexterity which the Newars long enjoyed.

(3)

ART AND ARCHITECTURE IN NEPAL

That the womb of the central Himalayas, the smiling valley of Kathmandu, could possess such a glorious past endowed with the most exquisitte development of art and architecture is something which puzzles an ordinary reader. Yet there is nothing more simple to account for, if we consider the various physical and psychic factors coming into play. Nepal has recorded a high stage of development in this particular line, and naturally therefore the Newars hold a high place amongst civilised men, a place which nobody can deny so long as these monuments of glory stand as witness to their unique achievements.

Yet Newari culture is in contrast with the material side of the Newar's life and with his present contribution to culture.

The valley of Kathmandu is itself an abode of all cultural excellences, through simple but marvellous stupas, lofty and beautifully designed pagodas, richly carved doorways and windows, finely gilt roofs, magnificent pillars and aweinspiring Baudha images, which are the pride and glory of that little land. Under the blue bright sky, in the soft cold of the morning, in the painted brilliance of the evening, with the background of the skykissing whiteness of the Himalayas in the far off North, surrounded by the green and eye pleasing hills, the valley spreads in resplendent grandeur. The way to Kathmandu is really hard, but to one who has once felt the inspiring thrill at the sight of the old stupas and majestic minarets, the valley has always held an irresistible glamour, all the rigours of the way vanishing like darkness before the sunlight.

The importance of the valley of Kathmandu lies in its geographical position. It occupies a central place in the middle and eastern Himalayas. It connects by the shortest route, viz , the Banepa-Kuti route, two great countries of the world, India and China. It is the biggest place for human habitation in the whole of the Himalayan region, the biggest valley, and the most cultivable plain. Nature has endowed it with almost all the

rich soils requisite for cultivation and with rich materials, like clay and timber. There is, therefore, no wonder that the valley could nurse a rich civilisation.

Climatically the valley enjoys the best conditions to preserve monuments, which are mainly constructed out of the two materials, wood and brick, wrought into architectural excellence and refinement.

Historically the valley is as old as the very oldest parts of India. The first settlement was that of a tribe of Aborigino-Mongols from the eastern Himalayas, who are now known as the Newars. Originally these people were animists, the trace of which is visible among the tribes of the eastern Himalayas in their various superstitious doctrines and vulgar pantheism. Buddhism threw a philosophic veneer over animism and endowed it with the best of aesthetic taste. The grotesque *Chaitya* changed into a simple and massive *Stupa*, the childish workmanship of an aboriginal grew to the highest expression of the inspired art, and absurd impulsive creations rose to profuse and elaborated designs and symbols.

THE STUPAS

The earliest specimen of this form of structure and perhaps the most ancient devotional monument lies in the South east of Kathmandu, in one of its suburb towns, called Patan. Except for relics in Tilaura and Piprawa, the stupas are the oldest monuments of architectural importance. These are five in number, four in the cardinal squares of the citadel and one at its centre. These are attributed to Ashoka. There is a stupa at Kirtipur, a fort town at the southeast of Kathmandu on a tiny ridge, but its origin cannot be traced out on account of the decorations and alterations adopted in course of time.

These stupas are of the shape of a hemisphere, constructed out of bricks on a plinth of the same (two, however, on a pavement of stone) and devoid of any architectural decorations. They are very simple and present an appearance of the very primitive edifices that took birth along with Buddhism. At the top there is a small chapel, which is the only ornament, but this is also so simple and of elementary execution that the usual environment is unaffecting. The chapel is dedicated to Vairochana. The hemisphere contains in its innermost

recess a chapel, entered through a by-door, now a depository for ceremonial purposes. At each lateral chapel attached to the hemisphere, which has changed from a simple stone vault into a multiple Pagoda, the images of the four of the meditating Buddhas, Amitabba, Ratnasambhava, Akshobya and Amoghasiddha betray a deep interfusion of the influence of the other sect, viz., the Mahahayana which, of course, represents the pre-tantric sculptural work. The central stupa is more like a *chaitya* and stands on a tier of brick and stone platforms, unlike the mere mass of bricks characteristic of the other stupas. The summit is a canopy cube-shaped and in the form of rings like the *toran*, which maintains a parasol (*Chhatra*) standing on a tripod of metal. The Ashokan stupas are respectively called, Laghan Tanda, Traitas Tanda, Phulcha Tanda and Zimpi Tanda.

Smaller mounds of earth supporting a Buddhist structure have also been found in different parts of the valley. Besides these, there are miniature stupas with a courtyard, of the description of larger works and essentially of the same design and execution. These are called *Chaityas* in Nepal and the site they occupy is known as *Chi-bahal* (small monastery). They belong to comparatively recent times and as such do not necessarily belong to an early type of non-conventional structure or of a pre-image conception of worship. They are iconographic like the latter images, as the five symbolic figures of the Buddha reveal. Yet the simplicity of structural design and taste has the bearing of an earlier iconography and sculpture and generally resemble the central stupa.

SWAYAMBHUNATH AND BAUDDHA

Not far from Kathmandu and at its western end overlooking the spacious valley, stands the four hundred feet high hillock which rears the Chaitya of Swayambhu with a multitude of miniature chaityas, pagodas, shrines and chapels all around. One travels only a mile over a terraced highway to reach the base of the hill leading to the top by a stony staircase, nearly three hundred steps, very steep and narrow, from the eastern side. From down below where one accosts three grand images of Buddha in meditative posture, one sees on both sides a masquerade of deities mainly in meditation and of stupas and

chapels of simple and beautiful design. The sanctity of the place is fully heightened by the peaceful poise of the images under the shade of the tall green trees which spread their branches as if in deep reverence towards the spirits dwelling in the images, the whole symbolising in a glorious manner the fundamental structure of the Newari social life permeated with Buddhist peace and harmony. The soft murmuring of a cool breeze, and the song of the birds impart a lulling sensation ; the devotee in a trance as it were, merging himself in the prayer, while he counts up his beads and enraptured by the occasional shouts of '*Buddha dharma Sangha*' coming from lips equally placid, feels himself in tune with nature and his environment, where all have combined to give an effect of a deep aesthetic quietness to the sacred monument of the Swayambhu.

The hillock is a continuation of the Bhimdhunga hill, a curved jutting towards the east and is separated by a chasm from another hill on which stands the chapel of Manjusri, the Chinese incarnation of Buddha, to whom the legend ascribes the humanising of the valley and installation of the self-existent therein out of a lotus flower—the common belief is that the hillock was a lotus flower, by a supernatural feat of drainage of the great lake that hid the beautiful valley in yore. Manjusri passes as a female deity, viz. Saraswati, in Saivite worship, but the belief has gained ground in spite of the image which definitely reveals a prominent feature of a Bodhisatwa. The summit where swayambhu is situated is a flat surface, some thousand square yards in area, almost every inch of it studded with religious images of the Great Buddha and his satellites, the Dhyani Buddhas. At the centre stands a monument on a plinth of stones, hemispheric in shape, completely whitewashed to look like an egg but which is bulging out in the middle and flattened narrowly at the northern pole to give the top the shape of a grove, which forms itself the base of a gilt *toran* with projecting cornice and with eyes painted on each side, which according to legend cast a benign look over the valley to protect it from destruction and sacrilege. Over the *toran* there lies a big sloping mass of wooden rings coated with gilt copper which hides the surface to match the whole perfectly with the brilliance of the *toran*. The finial is a

copper gilt bell-tower fenced in by a tripod with a broad metal base circular in shape and dexterously adorned with artistic pendents. Between the cupola and the smaller shrines there is a vacant space for processional rounding but so narrow as to lean against the iron framework which contains the prayer wheels with Tibetan symbols of *Mani padme hum* and a pair of flags. Attached to the dome are four chapels, mainly of bricks and plaster, with finely worked trellis and bell crowns.

The gilt Vajra (thunderbolt), called Dorje locally, lies just at the end of the staircase on the eastern vicinity of the stupa, and guarded by two lions of stone erected by Pratapamalla at the entrance. The basement is a stone disc standing on a drum carved in stone, the outer walls of which contain in bold relief the images of serpent, horse, sheep, monkey, goose, pig, rat, bull and hare—symbolic of astronomical cycles for Tibetan calendars. The disc is called *Vajradhatumandala.* Nearby the twin footmarks on a blackstone are also objects of veneration. A flame of sacred oil is always burning as if to keep up the glory of the lord, or perhaps to remind the world that the Great Light, the Buddha consciousness, is never put off.

The stupa of Buddhanath is another marvel of simplicity and undecorated beauty, which has been preserved to us for ages on a site near Pashupati between Kathmandu and Sankhu. The little village which forms the surrounding of the stupa lies on the way leading to Lhasa, which has led scholars to think that its antiquity is mixed with Lamaistic preachings. Be what it may, this place is a centre of pilgrimage to the Bhotiyas as well as to the Newars and attracts a large number of the former during winter. Unlike the *Swayambhu* stupa, the site of the Buddha has little of the elaborate decorations. The stupa is a central shrine around which are the dwelling houses of the *Lamas* and *Sherbas.* The stupa is enclosed by a wall. The base is of three successive pavements, on which the *Garbha* rests, and is approached by a flight of stairs. At the corners of the terrace stand small stupas in harmony with the main dome : they contain a row of niches. All other features exactly resemble those of Swayambhunath.

Such stupas are numerous in the valley, a dozen in Kathmandu, half a dozen in Patan and a quarter in Bhatgaon with a few more in other townlets like Harisiddhi and Thecho. The main stupas are Kathesimbhu, Mahabauddha, Tebahal, Yatkha, and Yagbahal. Many go back to early times, to times when the idea of representing deities in human form was largely discountenanced. They have nothing extraordinary about them, but Nepalese stupas betray the highest expression of a creative genius, of a keen and sensitive mind, which was destined to leave a rich legacy.

The stupa was originally designed as a place of worship or a rendezvous for the monks who occupied the shelters around the main shrine. Apparently the main features of the original monastic settlement disappeared in the thirteenth century, A.D. when the monastic order dwindled into comparative insignificance owing to the metamorphosis it sustained at the hands of the Shaiva reformers who bluntly subjected the priest class to the rigid influence of caste and marriage The present form is a large courtyard bordered by houses where live not monks but laymen. In the centre of the western side, which faces the stupa and reminds one of Kapilavastu, the house assumes the dimension and shape of a temple commonly of three stories, each roofed with tiles, which rise in diminishing proportions to the uppermost roof which supports the crownwork of a pinnacle, We shall deal later with the style of building. For the present it suffices to note that the central house is a temple and consists of the ground floor of a hall with a cage shut in by wooden or iron bars. The image is generally a Bodhisatwa in shining bronze.

THE TEMPLES

Kirkpatrick has rightly remarked that the valley consists of as many temples as there are houses and of as many idols as there are men. Kathmandu is a city of temples and so are Patan and Bhatgaon. Every inch of the sacred soil supports a shrine or an image. We have a few specimens of temples built purely on Indian style, specially medieval, like the Radhakrishna temple of Patan, which closely resembles the buildings in Fatehpur Sikri and Rajputana. There is the Mahabaudha temple of the same city, which was constructed on the

model of Bodhgaya temple and looks a little awkward. Many others of very recent origin also exist in certain places. But the majority of temples in the valley have their own individuality of design and structure, which have no parallel in India.

THE NEPAL STYLE

It is a mistake to take the temple style in Nepal as one deriving from the Pagoda style, since temples of the style existed in Nepal earlier than elsewhere. It is, therefore, not proper to consider the temples as derivatives and to call them Pagodas. They should enjoy in all justice a name which is attached to the place of their birth, and the style should be named as the Nepalese style.

At first sight the temples in Nepal look like Pagodas. The body is a square entablature of bricks rising in diminishing proportions to a great height, sometimes to the sixth story, with a roof on four sides of the wall at each story, which are sloping and conforming in regularly diminishing proportions to the size of the entablature. The roofs, tiled or copper gilt, are quadrangular and the uppermost roof is always of gilt copper. The entablature may stand on a terraced platform of stone and of as many stages as there are storeys, as is the case with the Nyatpola temple. Ordinarily the entablature rests on a colonnade of wooden pillars. The roofs are connected with the entablature by struts, which are set up in a projection at an angle of 45°. These struts form in many cases symbolic images of the deities of the main shrine. Sometimes the underparts are the object of vulgar carvings, with ridiculous pictures of sex life, which according to superstition are regarded necessary to resist lightning or other attacks of nature on the temple. The cornices in the window or above the door and the outer beams are finely decorated with elaborate carvings, rich pictographs of deities or foliage or designs in arabesque. The windows are nearly square and screened by a trellis ornamented by carving. They are also provided, specially on the front side, with balconies which project forward and give the whole window a slanting appearance. The doorway is surmounted by an architrave with a gilt copper finial (*Kalasa*) at the middle point and containing carved images of deities in bold relief on the surface, where the principal figure, that of a

mythological *Sarava*, holds two serpents in his hands, to bite them off. Round the edges of the roofs hang a series of small and thin bells with slender clappers which a mild rush of wind sets tinkling. The interior of the temple is as magnificent. Elaborate and beautiful carving is a common element of the decoration. The chapel occupies the hall, and there are no rooms, and around on the smooth red bricks of the wall are hung all sorts of vulgar collections of old swords, shields, pans, spinning wheels, rings, jars and horns.

Wood carving has reached a very high degree of excellence in Nepal. Every cornice, every lintel and every sill, every door, every window and pillar has the richest decoration of images and foliage. In point of form and style, in the perfection of control and balance, in the high degree of technical skill manifested, in grace and beauty, they have no rival. The images of deitites in struts and doorways, the variegated projections of arches, the ornamentation of doors with intricate designs of flowers and fruits, gracefully tapered pillars, the ornamental architecture—all give the most enjoyable sight to real artists.

Amongst the famous buildings of the Pagoda style are the Mahankal, Talejus, Durbar square groups, Matsyendranath in Kathmandu, temples of the same name and a few others in Patan and Nyatpola, Dattatraya and the Malla Palace in Bhatgaon, with the sacred monuments of Pasupatinath and Changunarayan in between. The Nyatpola stands on a plinth of five platforms in tiers, the staircase at each level provides symbolic figures as guards : first two men having ten times the strength of an ordinary man, second two elephants with ten times more strength, then other lions and two varieties of deities with increasing strength in the same proportion. The roofs of the temples in Durbar square are not curved and are of a shape and design to resemble an umbrella. To be singled out are the magnificent golden door of the Bhatgaon Palace and doorway of Changunarayan, in the most exquisite style ; nowhere eithere in Peking or in Lhasa, such richness and grandeur are visible.

Much of what has been handed to our generation is of the Malla Period, but draws its inspiration from the very early years of Nepalese history.

To those who attribute the style of Nepalese buildings and architecture to Tibet or China, this may seem strange. But they would do well to note that Chinese annals admit that the Pagoda style of temples was unknown in China or Tibet before the 9th century A. D. whereas every phase of it was adopted in Nepal as early as the 6th Century A. D. The Chinese Missions which visited Nepal in 646 A. D. and 665 A. D. have acclaimed the high artistic sense and taste of Nepalese.

The stupa is a copy of its Indian prototype, but the temple is essentially a Nepalese invention in design and structure. India has inspired Nepalese craftsmen in many other respects, and examples of close affinity between the architecture of the two countries are not rare. But the Pagoda style of temple is of Nepalese origin. It is a speciality and a grand one of the Nepalese master builder, where he has shown himself as an adept in symmetrical planning, richness of articulation and in happy blending of wood and bricks.

The temples of the usual Nepalese style should not be taken as simply an embodiment of one culture. We have here to guard ourselves against taking the style as purely Buddhist. In Nepal Buddhist and Shaivite temples exist side by side touching and pushing one another, in perfect concord and harmony. Some have sheltered even the deities of different sects in their chapels. This was what Yuan Chwang remarked, while he visited Nepal (?) and a tradition has been in progress since then to build a happy unity of culture expressed through artistic and architectural adaptations, which temples and sculptured images evidence.

Not only the temples, but many of the old palaces and houses have carved ornamentations in wood. The adoption of the temple architecture in ordinary houses was perhaps due to these being formerly inhabited by monks. They have the appearance of a shrine and the same style and serenity. Not so tall, they have yet not less than three storeys. They are badly ventilated with thin short storeys and small windows. Their outward appearance is impressive. The three old Palaces of the three cities with spacious halls, carved columns and brackets, courtyard pillars, and water sprouts, remind one of the designs so gloriously depicted in the T'ang annals.

The Nepalese images in gilt copper are also worth studying. The delicate poise of the images, the soft outline, the serene outlook, the simple but splendid garments make them superior to Chinese or Japanese images. Occasionally they are studded with precious stones, coral, amber, pearls and rubies, turquoise, etc. According to M. Levi, they have no equal. As early as the seventh century A. D., the taste for decoration with jewels had attracted the attention of the Chinese travellers and the later works bear the continuation of the same craftsmanship and taste. The most prominent gilt figures are of Dipankar, Tara, Luxmi, Saraswati and Krishna. Candle-holders, *aratipatram*, and jugs used for worship are equally rich.

SCULPTURE

Stone work in Nepal has closely followed developments in India. The earliest stone work, the sculptured image of *lingam* in the Pashupati temple, is a prototype of the *Bharashiva linga* in Nachna though in detail the Nepalese sculpture had shown an ingenuity of individual expression. But the most brilliant contributions of Nepal in this time is the pillar work. The Lichhavis under the Gupta influence popularised the conception of an all prevalent Deity, Shiva or Vishnu, who in abstract stood for anything, great and large, and was reduced in concrete to a beautifully shaped massive monolith or image. Such was the pillar of Changunarayan. The uppermost portion with the Garuda originally shaped has now given place to a disc and a lotus. The lower portion consisting of the shaft and the summit is, however, unchanged which gives us an idea of the simplicity and elegance of the ancient sculpture. The lower part of the shaft is squire but the upper one is octagonal while the summit is round. We have also the conventional lotus on a pillar at Harigaon, which has the same elegant and dignified expression of later pillar works.

Amongst the very early image works, the statue of Pasuparekha submerged on the bank of the River Bagmati, down below Pashupatinath, is worthy of note. The image lies partly broken ; only the head is visible. The head shows a pensive mood, eyes half-closed, face calm and quiet. The image of Garuda at Lajimpat is another example ; but it is also damaged. In the centre is a carved image of Vamam Vishnu

with his divine emblems, conch, disc, lotus and reclining in a posture indicative of perfect equilibrium. In the outer cricle are carved in small but bold relief a group of scenes portraying the whole story of his incarnation in the form of Vamana, from his birth to the final conquest of Bali. The representation is real, spontaneous, and free.

There are other innumerable carvings in stone, on pillars, walls and *chaityas* : the Jalasayana Vishnu at Buddhanilakantha, the Nyatpola images, the images of Soorya and Chandra on the gate of Siddha-pokhari at Bhatgaon, the Garuda image in front of the Krishna temple at Patan, lions in the Kumaristhan, the pillar at Attacknarain, the elephant at Ranipokhari : all belong to the medieval school of Nepalese arts but look as simple and magnificent as the earlier works. The three colossal statues of Buddha on the way to Swayambhunath are later specimens which show the influence of Pala sculpture.

PAINTING

The Chinese have profusely spoken of the high standard of Nepalese painting. Painting on the walls of a house in the valley was common in those days ; the custom has died down and even almost all of the wall paintings have disappeared. Happily painted covers of manuscripts have been preserved. These works on wood-surfaces are most brilliantly executed, and contain stories from Jatakas and the life-portraits of the eightyfour Siddhas, they bear an imprint of high skill in drawing and colouring.

The Nepal school of painting, as also the unconventional Tibetan painting of the Yellow Sect, is allied to the Gujrati and Pala schools in pictorial arrangement and design. The stories, pictured in Bendal's manuscripts as dealt with by Dr. Coomaraswamy and reproduced by him in his book, reveal the same influence and interfusion. The high and thick eye-brows and the pointed lips, in the picture showing the gift of the white elephant and in that depicting the Green Tara who is regarded as Princess *Bhrikuti* reveal a keen affinity with the Pala painting. In general they show a high technical knowledge, a rich imagination and a realistic expression of gesture, which is a speciality of Nepal. The colouring is remarkable.

The temple banners of a triangular shape in deep yellow or red or green also show a like mastery of colour. The banners are called *Thanka* ; they are generally of canvas or silk, rarely or never of wool or thick cotton.

GIFT TO INDONESIA

We have already remarked that the Pagoda style originated in Nepal. As early as the seventh century A.D., this country had established diplomatic and cultural relations with Tibet and China. To Tibet Nepal imparted a varied and rich cultural outlook aud gave her a religion and a script. Tibetan social and religious life is partly a Nepalese mould. Lhasa owes its existence to the Nepalese. The stupas and chaityas, pagodas and their painted walls, monasteries and wood carving, all reveal Nepalese inspiration and craftsmanship. From Tibet, Nepalese artists could carry their mission to China and Japan, Burma and Siam, and even to Ceylon where some at least of the old relics betray an influence of Nepalese art ; unfortunately for us no record of these missions is available to-day. But the life of Arniko preserved by the Yuan history sufficiently proves that Nepal's contribution to art and architecture of Indonesia was great. Arniko was a Newar who was called in by the Emperor Kublai Khan in 1246 A. D. to build chapels and images in China. He impressed the court with his ability and skill and received the highest honours.

This is what the Yuan history says :

'A-r-ni-ko quitted Nepal in 1243 A. D. in the reign of Abhayarmalla with a troupe of artists, sculptors and painters. He arrived at the court of Kablai Khan in 1263 A. D. His journey opened a new chapter in the history of the relation between the two countries.

'A-r-ni-ko was a Nepalese, the inhabitant of the country known as Pa-le-pou. While very young he showed signs of extraordinary intelligence not to be found in ordinary children, when a little older he could recite all the Buddhist texts by heart and could understand the meaning of them from beginning to end. Among his school fellows there was one who was a drawer, designer, painter, modeller and

decorator and who recited all the texts called canon of proportions. As soon as he had heard it once, A-r-ni-ko was able to repeat it. A little later nobody could excel him in designing, modelling and moulding metal images. In the first year of Tchong (1260 A. C.) an order was given to the teacher of the Emperor (Ti-che)Pa-k'o Se-pa (Phags-pa) for elevating in Tibet one Pagoda in gold. One hundred choice artists from Nepal were demanded to execute the work. Only eighty were available. There was a need of a leader artist but none could be found. A-r-ni-ko who was then only 27 asked permission to start. There was the difficulty on account of his tender age. But he said : I am young, my mind is not. They being allowed, therefore, departed.

'The teacher of the Emperor in observing that he was being charged with the superintendence of the work was greatly astonished. But when accordingly the Pagoda was completely built within one year, he was so impressed with A-r-ni-ko's ability that he took him (A-r-niko) to China to present him to the Emperor. Before that he was also baptised. The Emperor having observed him for a while interrogated: 'You arrived in the celestial Empire. Do you not get frightened?' He responded : 'Our stately trade is as a son of ten thousand countries. For a son to arrive before his father, what reason is there to fear ?' The Emperor interrupted : 'Why were you so ?' He replied : 'My fatherland is in the country of the occident. I had received the order of the sovereign to erect a stupa in Tibet. In two years I have executed that order. There I have observed disorder and war, the people are incapable of protecting their life.' The Emperor then asked : 'What is that you know making ? He replied : 'I know well how to design, model and mould metals.' The Emperor then ordered to restore a statue of copper dedicated to the Soong Emperors.

'In 1265 the statue was ready; the openings, the solid parts, the veins, the channels, nothing was missing. The artists in metal were amazed at this talent; there was not one of them but felt ashamed and humiliated. In all the monasteries of the two imperial citadels a large part of the statues came from his hands; also a wheel of the Law in iron with the seven jewels, which when the Emperor was visiting other places was carried before him to announce his approach; the portraits

of different Emperors which he painted on silk, no other painter could achieve his perfection. In about the tenth year of the Tche Yuan (1274 A. C.) he was given for the first time authority supreme over all the artists working on metal with a silver seal marked with a tiger. In 1279, by an imperial decree, he was called back to the state of a layman, he received different appointments, such as Controller of the Court of Imperial Manufacturers, etc. He enjoyed incomparable favour. After his death, he was granted posthumous titles with the name of Ming-hoei (Prompt intelligence).

MODERN ART

The Pagoda style and the A-r-ni-ko paintiug have ceased to influence Nepalese art to-day. They have given place to vulgar and conventional unartistic emblems. The carving in wood is a diminishing feature in Kathmandu, except in the temples which contain past creations. It is regrettable that the noblemen of Nepal do not think it desirable to preserve a faint trace of our traditional art in their stately palaces of western design; almost all the new houses in Nepal copy western models, unartistic and pretentious.

Great was the past of Nepal, magnificent its marvels. But they are gone. The decay after the sixteenth century A.D. is due to a state of political disruption and anarchy. A new valuation of the artisic and cultural aspect of life was born. The old ideal of a unified monarchy, the ideal of cohesion and concord built on conscious pantheism and toleration had died out. The rulers refused to act themselves as guardians of national culture and civilisation. Embroiled as they were in petty feuds and strifes, they lacked that broad mentality which was needed to keep up and weld together the various national forces. On the other hand, they had developed a greed which at its worst stage has not spared the very national interest. Civil liberty is lacking. People have lost their individuality and self-respect. Too much reliance is put in a decadent aristocratic culture and consequently power is vested in a few. And this has swept away what our forefathers handed down to us; it has spoiled the very tune of our national distinction and glory.

CHAPTER II

EARLY NEPAL

SOURCES

For the history of Nepal of this period we have as sources some inscriptions and foreign accounts but they exist only for the time after the third century A.D. The earlier part of the history has had to be, therefore, referred to the accounts of the chronicles called *Vansabalics* in Nepal, of which there are altogether three in our hands including the more authoritative find of Captain Kirkpatrick. Hindu mythological works available in the plains have almost without exception left Nepal out of their elaborate discourse. Only a few of them have passing reference, but these are quite unhelpful for our purpose inasmuch as they relate to the very dawn of the Nepalese history, and no amount of efforts would facilitate their verification. The value of the chronicles on that account is so great that althouh the narrative is fantastic yet as the only available material for the period under review, they are indispensable. We shall now proceed to consider the extent to which the references in *Purana* and the *Vansabalis* provide a source for the history of our period. (600 B.C. to 600 A.D.) [1].

Before considering the authenticity or otherwise of the chronicles, let us now refer to some other treatises belonging to the plains as different from those traced in the valley proper. We have two principal treatises of this type apart from many others which give only brief references. These two, the *Nepal Mahatmya and Swayambhu Purana*, have extensively dealt with the description of the Nepal valley, but like other sources of the type they are valueless for our purpose. *Attharvaparisistha* has placed Nepal alone with *Udumbara* and *Kamrupa* (Weller, Ind. Studien, VIII, 413, X, 319). In the *Brihatkatha Paichasi* of *Gunadya* there is a line about one Raja Yasaketu who was ruling in the city of Shiva in Nepaladesha (Somadeva, Kathasaritsagara, XII, 22, V. 3 ; Ksemendra,

1. Wright, *History of Nepal*. Translaed from the *Vansabali*, 1867.

Captain Kirkpatrick, *Account of the Kingdom of Nepal*.

Sylvain Levi, *Le. Nepal*, Vols. II. III, and *Vansabalis* in possession of some individuals in Kathmandu.

Brihat Kathamanjari, IX, V. 728). In the sixth century A. D. Varahamihira has mentioned Nepal along with certain other hill principalities (Levi II, p. 63). *Bharat's Natyasastra* has also a like reference (XIII. 32). The *Mulasarvastivada-Vinaya* which was traced out by I-tsing in 700 A.D. gives a story about how Buddha persuaded some of his disciples not to enter Nepal, as in his conception the country was impassable, and full of ferocious tribes (Levi, II, p. 181). But all these references are as much inadequate as they relate to persons and places not identified, and therefore, the whole trend of findings as to data and incidents is inconclusive.

The only source of information for the very early period of Nepalese history is the group of chronicles which we have already referred to in the beginning. These serve as excellent materials so far as they provide a clue, however defective, to the chronology of the period. The long list of names appearing like an unbroken chain is a very valuable contribution of the chronicles. But unfortunately these lose much of their significance in view of their undue emphasis on the numerical strength of the genealogy, which they have pushed to a limit unwarranted by facts. They suffer mainly from inaccuracy of dates and inexactitude of regnal years which have been carelessly inserted to render the whole work fantastic and consequently unreliable. The whole tenor has been spoiled under a false notion that the history of a country has had to be connected with the episode of the Mahabharata if it has to inspire faith and reverence in the readers in respect of the country's past achievement. But this gave a result which proved itself on verification basically wrong, as it involved undesirable manipulation of names and years contrary to ali factual presentation. An analysis of the account of the Vansabalis shows beyond doubt that they have allotted fictitiously long years of rule, intro duced imaginary dynasties, reversed the order of succession and sacrificed contemporaneity of events to effect a wrongly detailed adjustment [2].

In two places the error has been too glaringly manifest to escape our notice, which may be taken as almost a general example of chronolo-

2 Levi, II, Ch. II; IA, XIII, 412 c; IA, XIV, 345 ff; Kirkpatriek, 260 ff; Hamilton, Ch, IV; Wright, Ch. I; IA, VIII, p 89.

gical fantasy. We find that Amshuvarman who according to Yuan Chwang flourished in about the time he visited India figures in the list of those who ruled the valley some seven hundred years earlier.

According to the chronicle he succeeded the throne in 3100 years past Kaliyuga corresponding to 101 B. C, whereas his inscriptions have put that date in 595 A. D. In the same strain all events preceding and following Amshuvarman have been wholly misplaced earlier than warranted by factual evidence, though the divergence of years seems to narrow down as the chronology approaches the thirteenth century A. D. But there too it is only a case of narrowing down and misplacement does not disappear, as in many instances contemporaneity has been sacrificed to fill the gap, and the two rulers who should have come in one place come one after the other. This method of juxtaposition and transposition has been very generally followed by the chroniclers for almost every period of the Nepalese history.

Of course, the chroniclers were hard put to it to follow such a course of action. As inadequacy in the numerical strength of the ruling dynasties would have it, they had to resort to a process of filling by imaginary dynasties, but this also not being widely possible they thought to mend matters by remoulding the entire order. So they lengthened reign periods, and the order of contemporary names was entirely recast to make them succeed one after the other. It follows that the chronicles have generally allotted sixty or seventy years to one reign, and in one particular instance, for six successors of Amshuvarman, a reign of hundred years each, which beat down all the cases of fantastic enumeration. Even a few fictitious dynasty of rulers had to be introduced, and the most prominent example of such insertion is provided by the *Ayodhya* stock whichis indisputably proved to be only a product of the chronicler's imagination. Likewise the *Ahirs*, the successors of the Guptas, whose contemporaneity with some notable Indian Princes of the period has been incontrovertibly established by the *Maujusrimulakalpa* and local inscrip tions, were put in the early years of Kaliyuga some three thousand years earlier.

Notwithstanding these errors the Vanasabalis have, however, invariably supplied names in regard to the history of the period, which had to

go without them for lack of authentic materials given by the inscriptions or foreign accounts as the case may be. To this extent they have proved immensely helpful to the historian of Nepalese history[3].

Incidentally as far as the research material available uptodate is concerned, there is little glimpse into the time in question in inscriptions or available narratives. These are traced to belong to a very late period of our history to the 4th century A. D., and as such one has to depend exclusively on the chronicles for the history of the entire period previous to that century. Our conclusions, therefore, are independent of the universally acknowledged evidence of inscriptions or like data for the history of that period.

We may note here that all the Puranas except the *Swayambhu* which is a very recent product have maintained cryptic silence in regard to the history of Nepal. It is possible that the absence of any sort of mention in these might have been due to ignorance about the country which, because of the insurmountable barriers of the mid-Himalayan ranges, was virtually closed to outsiders for a very long time. The chronicles have tried to trace the history of Nepal to the very early years of world history, but in the absence of authentic records, the account they produce loses much of its significance as far as it remains to be corroborated by factual evidence. Yet there is no other way save to form an outline of the early history on the materials supplied by them, and we have to guard ourselves against taking very seriously the order of events they have so laboriously presented. In any case some anecdotes have come as a link between important events of proved reliability, and we have used them in probable details as we give the following narrative for the dawn of Nepalese history and culture.

The chronicle begins the history of the Nepal valley from the time when it was totally submerged under water. It is said that at the dawn of Satyayuga there was a self grown lotus in the middle of the lake, which flowering later on transformed itself into a hillet. This was the very God appearing on earth, and the great *Bipaswa Buddha* and *Biswa*

---

3 The chronicles though all of them agreeing on the main point of chronological order do differ in details, but this alone does not make any difference as to their utility as historical treatises. Some of them have also pursued a particular theme in the story of a deity which differs from the one to the other.

Buddha were attracted to the valley mainly on that score. But they could not dry the land, which was left to *Manjusri* who cut the gorge in Chobahar, and thus dried the lake. This Boddhisatva was responsible for humanising the valley, and the first settler was the Gauda King whose descendants ruled for a long time. The chronicles assert that Nepal under these rulers had maintained occasional intercourse with India and Ceylon which helped this country to build up trade and commerce. The last descendant of the Gauda emigrant lost his possession to the King Dharamdutta of Kanchi.

The Vansabalis then proceed to depict another stage of the valley under water which was caused by the furious demon Devasur who was later on killed by Lord Krishna. The lake again was emptied, and human life returned with the coming of the Matatirtha dynasty of Nemi who is said to have given the name Nepala to the country. Here the chronicles bring in the Ahir dynasty to succeed the Matatirtha rulers, but we will come to know later on that the Ahir dynasty belongs to another period, some one thousand years after[4].

With that exception the legend has passed as a historical narrative for an account of the dawn of the Nepalese history. The part of the account where mythological figures are given prominent role may appear only a fantasy, but as genealogical findings have shown, the valley of Kathmandu was at one time simply a lake. Much below the surface of the land some leaves and petals have been traced, which again points to the existence of plants before the submersion. If originally the valley was a lake the petals in the subterranean region do only indicate the valley being under water for the second time.

The Kirata Dynasty

After the Neminites, the valley came in the possession of the Kirata tribes who had invaded the country from the east. It is said that the first part of the country to come under them is the present site of Thankot. It, however, appears that the capital Matatirtha being situated in this area, Thankot was the last exploit of the Kiratas. As is natural in

4 The same Neminites according to Wright's authority were of the stock of Chandravansis.

the case of an invasion from the east, the penetration might have begun at a point near Sanga, and ended with the westernmost point at Thankot.

The Vansabalis brings in the Ahir Dynasty in between the Neminities and Kiratas, but as we have already observed, it is a wrong presentation, the Ahirs on all evidences being a group of late comers whose association with the history of Nepal begins from the late fifth century A.D.

The first date of the Kiratas must occur near about the 7th century B. C., although the chronicles put them in 3100 B. C. at the initial year of the Kaliyuga.

The Kirata tribe occupies ar present the portion of the eastern territories of Nepal, between the rivers Sunkosi and Arun. Nothing is known about these people in relation to ancient Nepal beyond the vague estimate of the Nepalese chronicles. But it has been inferred that the Kiratas spoken of by the Vansabalis and legends were an offshoot of the tribe now living in that part of the country called Kiratadesha. As the Newars happen to be the oldest inhabitants of the valley, their identity with the historical Kiratas as their own descendants may not appear farfatched. Some scholars, and amongst them Hamilton have identified Newars with the Khat Bhotiyas implying thereby the Tibetan origin of this people, but except on some common linguistic features the conclusion seems to have been too farfetched. It will suffice to note here that the very antiquity of the Newars is a proof of identification and close affinity of the two communities and we may state with much surety that the references about Kiratas in Mahabharata (II, 1089) and Ramayana (IV, 26D) are implied for the Newars and similar peoples[5] inhabiting the North East Himalayas.

The pre-Kirata period.

As we have observed the Brahmanas and Upanisadas, and the Epics and Puranas do not throw any light on Nepal or its conditions in ancient time. We have found the same attitude in the *Jatakas* and *Nikayas*

5 JBRS, 1938, article by Dr. Jayaswal.

and there is complete silence as to this country[6]. The Mahabharata occasionally refers to it but not under a name by which it is known to-day. The great Epic calls the country as Kiratadesha. But from this no idea about the location of the country can be formed. On the other hand it may give the impression that the Kiratadesha is not the valley of Kathmandu, as we have a country of that name in the extreme east of the Himalayan range[7]. Also in the list given by the Brahmanas and Upanisads, Nepal does not find a place, as will appear below.

1. Gandhara	2. Kaikeya	3. Madra
4. Usinara	5. Matsya	6. Kuru
7. Panchala	8. Kashi	9. Kosala
10. Videha.	(Rai Chaudhury, p. 49).	

The list gives a country near about Hardwar, but no territory beyond that is signified, thus the some is ignoring one of the most important part of the Himalayas.

From various discourses it is now gathered that after the Mahabharata War, the centre of the activity shifted from Kurudesha to Videha[8]. In its palmy days the Kingdom of Nepal occupied the portion of territory between the river Gandak and river Sunkosi and its southern boundary touched the river Ganges. There is no precise evidence about whether Videha included the Himalayan ridges as well.

But it would not be entirely incorrect to attempt to establish a link between Videha and Nepal, if what we have drawn as to the identity of the Newars with the Kiratas is not incorrect, for not only the link in the time of the Lichhavis but the nearness of the valley of Kathmandu to that region might prove as well that there was, at least, a rough line of collaboration between the two countries from a very ancient time.

6 Levi, II, pp. 175 ff.

7 There are two discricts of the name incorporating the regions between river Tama Kosi and river Dudh Kosi.

8 Ramayana, I, 71, 3, Vayu Purana 89, 25 ; Gaina Uttara Adda Yaas S.B.E. XLV, 97 ; Majhimaniyaya II. 74-83.

The Kirata rulers

There were three main hordes of Kiratas, which invaded the valley in the course of three centuries preceding the beginning of the history of Nepal, which we have fixed at C700 B.C., and of which the first and second definitely preceded that year and the third, the last of them, seems to have settled down during that century. The names of the Kings appearing in the Vansabalis, 29 in number, which I have given herewith show a close affinity with the modern tribal appendage of the present day Kiratas, e.g. Kulung, Thulung, etc. which bears a close resemblance to Yellung forming the name of the last stock migrating into the valley of Kathmandu. It may also be noted here that the Newari name for Patan, *Yell*ai is no doubt a changed form of Yellung and implies the earliest association of that town with the Newars who were most probably the Yellung Kiratas themselves.

The time assigned to the twenty-nine rulers by the Vansabalis which amounts to 1118 years seems, however, a gross exaggeration (according to Levi 1178 and 1581 according to Kirkpatrick) as has been already hinted as also the attempt to place them in 1739 B.C. This of all the exaggerated estimates is yet the least corroborated item and to contrary has been disproved with reference to the time of Gautam Buddha (600 B.C.). Taking the dynasty as one with a regular and unbroken period of reign and ascertaining the total at the average rate of 25 years for each reign we have 25x29 equal to 725 years. On the basis of the date of Ashoka's visit, which we may put roughly in the year 240 B.C. and which according to the chronicles was also the year of Sthumko, the fourteenth of the Kirata line, we may take the early 6th century B.C. as the initial period of the Kirata rule. It, however, does not seem proper to include the two names omitted by Kirkpatrick for although there was a Kirata revival during the last reign of the first Lichhavi dynasty, it is not at all certain that the revival was affected by the Yellung Kiratas. It is possible that the revival in question signified a series of raids carried out by a ferocious tribe rather than any event of historical importance.

The following is the list of names according to the Vanasabalis :—

	Wright.	*Kripatrick.*	*Levi.*
1.	Yalambara	Yellung	Yalamba
2.	Pavi		Pambi
3.	Skandhara	Dush Khan	Dhaskan
4.	Valamba	Ballancha	Valamba
5.	Hriti	Kingly	Hritti
6.	Humati	Hunanter	Humati
7.	Jitadesi	Tuskah	Galimja
8.	Galimja	Sroopust	Jitadesi
9.	Puska	Gitadestry	Tuska (Puska-Idraji)
10.	Suyarma	Punchem	Suyarna
11.	Pava	Kingking King	Parba
12.	Bunka	Soonand	Pancha (Thouka)
13.	Swananda	Thomoo	Kemke (Kpj, 12
14.	Sthunka	Jaghru	
15.	Gighri	Janreo	Thumko
16.	Nane	Suenkeh	Nane
17.	Luk	Thoor	Luk
18.	Thora	Thamoo	Thora
19.	Thoko	Burmah	Varma
20.	Varma	Gunja	
21.	Guja	Kuskkoon	Puniska
22.	Puskara or Puska[9]	Teeshoo	Gumja
23.	Kesu	Sooghree	
24.	Suja	Joosha	Sunsa Sunga
25.	Sansa	Contho	Sammu, Samsu
26.	Gunam	Khemboo	Gunam, Gunja
27.	Khimbu	Gully Jung	Simbu

9 Dr. Jayaswal believes that Sungas also exercised sovereingty over Nepal (p. 261). He does so on the basis of silver coins out from Western Nepal (Almora coins JBORS, xx, p. 301).

28. Patuka
29. Gasti[10]

If the identification of the Newars with the oldest emigrants, the Kiratas of the legend, is correct, then in that case the Kirata rule may pass for a real self rule of the indigenous people. The Kirata tribe on the understanding that it is the same as Newars was the ancestor of all those residents in the valley who betray Mongoloid features. These form a majority in that region, and any variation can safely be attributed to the emigrants from the Indian plains. As a minority the non-mongoloid stocks might not have entered the valley in hordes, but a few families of conquerors seem to be the inevitable choice, who might have lived in regular state of inter-marriage with the vanquished. We have therefore, some truth in the statement that the valley of Nepal had ceased to enjoy self rule as soon as the Kiratas disappeared from the scene as rulers. But this is not wholly true, for all the rulers from the earliest time to the present day, though nevertheless emigrants from the plains, had completely identified themselves with the ruled. The legend speaks all of them as Newar rulers, and the popular belief handed to the present generation does not confirm otherwise. Accidentally the ruling stock since the Kiratas has been Indian without exception.

The chronology does not mention the Lichhavi dynasty as to have belonged to the Nepalese throne. It notes the dynasties of the moon and the sun known as Chandravansis and Sooryavansis. These lists are so confusing that no one stock is distincly identified. Each contains an interfusion on that score and this is all the more galling. The very early dynasty is linked with the recent one, and blood relationship is established between those who do not share anything common excepting the

10 Levi, II, pp. 78-79. Jayaswal, JBORS, XXII, Part III, pp. 260-61. Wright, p. 100, Kirkpatrick, p. 259; IA, XIII, p. 412.

About Ashoka's entry, the Rock Edict No. 13 does not mention Nepal in the list of the countries visited by him (Smith, E. H. pp. 365-66); but the pillars and Stupas in Nepal point out that he visited the valley (JBORS, ibid, p. 260). Monahan disbelieves the annal altogether. (*Early History of India*, p. 221). He might have or might not have visited the valley. The chain of pillars and stupas northwards from Pataliputra connecting the foot of the Himalayas, is not a clear proof of his visit, but shows at least the direction his message had travelled. And if the stupas in the valley which on all evidences happen to be associated with Ashoka were to come as a determinant, we will not be wrong to establish the fact of his visit.

throne they occupied. Out of so many chronicles only one authority, that of Kirkpatrick, has given a list which approximates the probable numerical strength of the royal genealogical order, but even that suffers from numerous irregularities, and cannot be accepted without amendment. We have therefore, absolutely no use of the chronicles at this stage of the Nepalese history except that the list of Sooryabansis may be passed for the Lichhavis who ruled Nepal for about eight hundred years with short breaks at regular intervals.

According to the inscriptions and a few reliable authorities like *Manjusri Mulakalpataru* and *Sumatitantra* it is now unanimously ascertained that the period of Nepalese history from the early years of the Christian era down to the end of the eighth century was the Lichhavi period, and there is no reason to accept the classification of the chronicle which omits the Lichhavis altogether.

Except Kirkpatrick's authority all other chronicles give a dynasty naming it Somavansis as successors of Kiratas, which includes Bhaskarvarman and his predecessors. Bhumivarman is given a new dynasty to begin with, which they designate as the Sooryavansis. This classification as already referred to is inadmissible, as according to other data we have a continuity of a single reginal dynasty in this period. Kirkpatrick's authority, however, puts the lists together, and is more reliable.

Kuveravarman Kakavarman Pusparekha
Bhaskaravarman Bhvmivarman
Chandravarman

Jayavarman is given as a successor of Chandravarman but the Ins. no I. places him at the initial stage of Lichhavi rule, if he is identified with Jayadeva I; so we have again the same confusing items of statement.

Here the main problem is to present an arrangement fixing regnal data for the names mentioned in the chronology. In the next instalment we will deal with all the debatable points and try to ascertain factual dates for these in relation to more reliable records other than the chronicles available to us.

The period beginning after the fall of the Kiratas to the accession of those of the Lichhavis whose identity has been proved with reference

to the inscriptions (1 & 2) is being called the dark period of the Nepalese history (Jayaswal, p.261). Indeed as far as reliable data are concerned, this particular period is conspicuous by their absence. But so far no attempt has been made to improve on the usually vague interpretation of the epoch-year of the era of the earlier inscriptions. Both Levi and Fleet fixed the epoch-year at some period after the second century A.D., which complicated the whole situation by creating a gap in the royal chronology for that period. We are not entering into the merlts or justifiability of these opinions at this stage; this we have reserved for a subsequent discussion, but there is no doubt that on the epoch-year being pushed earlier to somewhere in the early first century A.D., the gap is readily filled up. The chronicles come to our rescue in regard to this particular information as they not only supply a list of names in adequate numerical strength, but also delineate events which indirectly explain the cause of the silence of the above inscriptions about them. It is quite possible that the author of inscriptions thought it improper to mention names which did not belong to an independent period of Nepalese history. According the chronicles, the Kings lost independence from the initial period of their occupation on account of Indian invasions which probably meant Kushan encroachment. As the coinage of the period which has a great resemblance with the Yuluchi coinage shows, the influence exerted from India was not insignificant. On this understanding the so-called dark age will give continuity to the history and chronology of ancient Nepal.

The actual point in discussion, however, is the very basis fixing a datum as to the various names from the end of the Kushan rule down to Vrsadeva whose reign we have pushed to 350 A.D. or so, following the observation of the inscriptions. It appears by an average calculation of the regnal periods of the fifteen kings after Ashoka that the Kirata rulers were no longer ruling in the valley during and after the fifties of the first century A.D. The calculation has proceeded under the assumption that the average reign of each is 20 years, and that Ashoka had visited the valley in the year 240 B.C. From 50 A.D. to 350 A.D. i.e., for a period of three hundred years, Nepal seems to have lost its Independent status under regular domination from Pataliputra except for a brief interval at the very initial period under Jayadeva I, which explains

the omission of many names from the list of the inscriptions. The Lichhavis had probably migrated into the valley during the early years of Kushan rule out of fear of invasion, and had found easy shelter there on account of the withdrawal of the Sungas who had to give in to the Kushans. But they were pursued even in the fastness of the sub-Himalayan region, and consequently they had to surrender the valley as well. It is possible that the remaining portion of the Lichhavis in Vaishali were wiped out or migrated elsewhere along-side. As coins in the name of Kadphises I and II, which were dug out in the valley support the conjecture, it is much probable that these two Kushan Emperors had Nepal under their control[11]. The Kushan had their capital at Sarnath, while they had established a viceroyalty in North Bihar, and the nearness of the valley of Nepal to North Bihar was what probably brought the country under Kushan domination at that time.

After the Kushans came the Satabahanas in the domain of Patali-Putra. But while Kushan coins were dug out in the valley, for the Satabahana influence there is no trace of evidence so that their rule in the valley seems an improbability and this was perhaps because they controlled Magadha only for a short time (Jayaswal, History, 150-350 A.D. p. 113). Similarly the probability of Yaudheya rule seems remote on account of the distance intervening between the two countries.

We have a piece of evidence for the history of this period from a book called "*Sumati-tantra*" which will be referred to in another connection. The evidence it notes appears to relate to the main current of Indian history, but as Manadeva is put in that list as to have followed the predecessors, amongst whom the chronicle mentions Nandas and Mauryas, the inference that certain rulers in Pataliputra were recognised as overlords in the valley may not be entirely inadmissible and to this Ashoka's entry into the valley and the existence of Kushan coins therein may lend some colour.

The Bakataka kings who destroyed the Kushan rule seem to have wielded a good deal of influence in the valley. It was not, however, in

11 Walsh, JRAS, 1908, p. 677. V. Smith, Catalogue of Indian coins, p. 179, Rapson, Indian Coins, pp. 10, 32 (I. A. Ph. and after Tunuskunda); Cunningham, CAI; p. 12.

the field of politics or by way of aggrandizement that the influence was made felt. The penetration rather came through cultural contact with Pataliputra where the Bakatakas had shifted in that century. The valley of Nepal in those days, as naturally under the non-Brahmanic Kiratas and Lichhavis and under the Kushans who seem to have propagated ritualistic Buddhism with wonderful figures, in wood carvings and sculptures obeyed the tenets of Buddhist religion. But as soon as the Bharasivas and Bakatakas ousted the Kushans, there was an all round revival of Shaivite faith Nepal did not stand isolated from the touch of this revival. Perhaps the revival of the cult of Pashupati under Pashuparekhadeva was the symbolic expression of that religious regenaration. According to the legend, the sanctuary of Pashupatinath was at one time controlled by the Buddhists and the image then set up was a Bodhisatwa. But after the Lichhavis were converted into Shaivite worship possibly during this reign, the cult of Bodhisatwa as the state patronised religion disappeared from the court, though the general populaiton by a huge majority had still adhered to the old system. Apart from the cult of Shiva, the influence of art and sculpture was also very striking. The image of Pashupati[12] has a close resemblance to its prototype Mukhalinga. of that age in Nachna (Pl I, x and xi, JBORS, 1933, P. 218). The four faces of the Linga are ingrafted on a hardstone appearing as jutting forth from the surface though very imperceptibly and with the hands shown with Rudraksa beads, which is quite in tune with the facial projecture. The image forms on the whole a beautiful masterpiece of the early third century sculpture (K.P.J. ibid, p. 161-62; IA, XIII, p. 413).

In Nepal there is a dearth of accient monuments dating as far back as the period in review, most of them having been demolished in course of centuries; but the image of Pasbupatinath has an importance of its own to have outlived those ruinous ages and if properly interpreted may shed some lustre on the contemporary history of that period. The Anka coins of Manadeva and Gunakamadeva have also resemblance with the Vikramanka coins of Chandra Gupta[13].

12 Dr. Indraji probably ascribes the slyle to the Guptan period, or to the one just after, when comparing it with the Mathura and Bhilsa lingas. The shrine of Pashupati came under the Saivas since that time (IA, IX, p. 166).

13 CIM, p. 281, II, p. 108.

One such historical association which the image maintains has rendered it easier to correct the geneological chart of the chronicles as it stands there. If Pusparekha, the founder of the Pashupati temple, be identified as belonging to the Bakatakan period, a large part of the blank page of the Nepalese history can thus be filled up. In this case Jayavarman, as hinted, should be transferred to the very earliest place at the head of the dynasty. Jayadeva I is identified with him and as such he must be given as near a place to Nimisha, the founder of the dynasty in Nepal, probably intended for Jayadeva himself who was the first Lichhavi. It should be borne in mind that Nimisha is a corrupt form of Lichhavi (Nichhivi, Nimishi) which is supported by Kirkpatrick's authority (page 260) in calling the dynasty "Nivesit[14]. Nimisha comes some twenty generations before Vr'sadeva and on the allotment of 15 or 16 years for each generaration, his date coincides with that of Jayadeva I, rendering identification almost factual[15]. Now from the evidence of the Bakataka images, the same conclusion can be arrived at. Pusparekha occurs in the fourth generation and taking some fifty years at the interval between Jayadeva I and the Kirata revival he can be placed without doubt in the beginning of the third century A. D. His father Kuveravarman might have seized the doman after the Kushan withdrawal[16].

The five or six names belonging to the first branch of the Lichhavi dynasty must thus precede the date of Vr'sadeva of the second list so that the whole may textually agree with the numerical strength of the entire list. The names previous to Kakavarman should come from the front portion of the second list and placed earlier to Vr'sadeva.

After the end of Kushan rule, India was overrun by a new wave of religious and cultural awakening amongst the people, which was further pushed and extended with unwavering zeal by the Shaiva Guptas who had now freed the court from its age long attachment to Buddhism. But Nepal had so far remained aloof from the major current of revialist

14 JBORS, Op. Cit, p. 258.

15 Wright, pp. 113 ff.

16 The list contains, besides Kuveravarman, persons like Kakavarman, Pushavarman, Bhaskaravarman and Jayavarman.

forces working in the plains, and here unlike in India the court was the first to be affected by these changes. The result was that Buddism never ceased to influence Nepalese social life, even at its worst, and with the Shaivite revival it worked out a novel form of union between the two faiths. Nepal had thus shaken off sectarianism from the very early period of its history and could develop a distinct mode of worship peculiar to itself.

How the court was metamorphosed under Shaivite influence is shown by a legend of Shankaracharya which wrongly brings the southerner to indicate the revival at the time of King Shankaradeva, the son of Vr'sadeva (IA, XIII, p . 95 ff), who was earlier a confirmed Buddhist and whose emblem as such in his dedication of a trident at the altar of Pashupati stands till to-day so prominent but in the form of a Shaivite metamorphosis. Till the time of Pasupadeva, Buddhism had not ceased to be popular in the court, as individual Kings extended their support and patronage to it alongside Hindu revivalist culture. But this flourishing of two modes of worship side by side paved the way for interfusion between the two, and we find that the spirit of isolationism so long attached to Buddhism in the valley now evaporated. The culture, and the belief thus emerging were supported by a state of amity and concord amongst the followers of both sects, who completely subscribed to this unified cult of worship. Since then the feud once so common in the camps died a natural death, and the valley of Kathmandu was purged of the evils of sectarianism. This was, however, not a product of this particular age. The process of amalgamation which had started since the days of Ashoka had only reached a happy culmination at that period. At the interval it was nurtured and nursed by other teachers, and it ended in a happy synthesis in the revivalist age. But unlike the past it was, now, not a partial amalgamation. While the court alone in the earlier age happened to be influenced by Shaivite cult the people remaining aloof from the main current of earlier renaissance, this time the revival affected the whole populace, and the Buddhist mass of people underwent a rejuvenation through the interfusion of the two modes of worship. The present day happy blend of Shaivite and Buddhist cultures originates from the Gupta Revivalist movement.

That the people unhesitatingly adopted the common culture at that time is obvious from various inscriptions where Hindu Kings have tendered their homage to Buddha and other Mahayanist deities and vice-versa, which shows the harmonious relation between the followers of the two sects. It may be added here that the other vehicle of Buddhist worship, the Hinayana, was equally respected till the seventh century A.D.

The Gupta renaissance in India was preceded by a very glorious period of events and achievements in Nepal, which was responsible for giving a lift to the Guptas later on in the Indian history (JRAS, 1881,55). The person who shone as the Sun of this glory was no other than Bhaskara-varman, to whom the chronicles have attributed the conquest of the whole of northern India. We may not accept the validity of the estimate which seems much exaggerated in its applicatian to that extent, but there seems little doubt that at the height of his power he was little less than the master of at least a considerable portion of northern India extending from Saketa to Pundravardhana. That the Lichhavis were one of the most important ruling of dynasties of India at that time is well evidenced by the coins of Chandra Gupta[17] the reverse of which shows in clear letters the legend *Lichhaviyah* as posibly expressive of the King's acknowledgement of that position and of the fact of his having come to the power through their help. It is now generally admitted that Chandra Gupta I and his son Samudra Gupta could consolidate their positions in Magadha mainly on account of the strong support they received from their relatives, the Lichhavis. At the time he succeeded to the throne of his father, Samudra Gupta could not claim much a greater portion of northern India than what then comprised Magadha and Saketa, the latter known at present as Ayodhya, and according to *Kaumudi Mahotsava,* he obtained Saketa from his maternal grand-father.

Now if one could establish that the same Lichhavis happened to be the ruling dynasty in Nepal, the problem of Bhaskarvarman's identification would be solved for we have on the basis of Samudra Gupta's Saketa acquisition that the territorial expansion of the Lichhavis was as wide as to cover a big kingdom in north India. For this we will have to find out if a separate

17 Jayaswal, op. cit, p. 259.

Kingdom of the Lichhavis existed at Vaishali, which, however, seems quite improbable in view of the silence of Gupta records about that region altogether. The conclusion, therefore, is obviously to take the rule of Lichhavis in Nepal, and its continuity during the whole of Gupta period as a fact, and even if the later Guptas happened to encroach on the territories of their Lichhavi relations, we can believe Samudra Gupta to have upheld their prestige and power over a large part of the areas which comprised their empire. Vaishali in all probability formed a part of Nepal till the death of Samudra Gupta.

As the absence of any reference to Vaishali in the inscriptions of Samudra Gupta leads us to imagine, the grand-son of the Lichhavi emperor might have acted with solicitude of one to whom the very idea of pushing his frontier on that side was unpalatable. He could not, of course, finish those who had helped him to the kingship of Magadha. There was such a thing as gratitude. It is much possible that he left Nepal in control of Vaishali with exactly the same status as enjoyed by the Bakatakas under his son.

We, however, look in vain for Vaishali to continue in that state in the next reign, Vaishali not only does not occur in the list of kingdoms, frontier or Vassal, but the whole region wherein it was situated is indicated to have come under the rule of Chandra Gupta II who had absorbed it in the viceroyalty of North Bihar. In Samudra Gupta's pillar incriptions, on the other hand, Nepal has received a reference as a frontier kingdom, and this coupled with the complete absence of evidence as to his conquest of Vaishali may be taken so as to mean that as long as Samudra Gupta was in power the empire of the Nepal Lichhavis did not under go any diminution of territories. It is possible that Vaishali was lost to the Guptas is the next reign.

Chandra Gupta I's contemporary was Bhumivarman, and his son's probably Vr'sadeva. The exact date of the introduction of Gupta supremacy over the Lichhavis cannot be ascertained, but it seems that the latter had acknowledged the overlordship of the Guptas sometime during the reign of Chandra Gupta II. The chronicle asserts that the Guptas had extended their influence in the valley before the ascendancy of

Vasantadeva. We have, however, neither the evidence of local inscriptions nor of any parallel records relating to Guptas to prove their domination of the valley except that a section of the Guptas are shown by the Vansabalis to have been ruling in Nepal during the next two centuries, which the MMK also confirms. But the cultural influence of the Guptas had penetrated earlier, which seems to have been cast indelibly on the then prevailing mode of art and architecture. The pillar and Garuda image of Changunarayan, which belong to this period are living examples of those cultural inroads, of which every sculpture and carved relief tells a Gupta story.

In political ideology the Gupta period produced a profound change. It introduced the system of monarchy in the country and amongst the people who had so long resisted the monarchical institution (*Hindu Polity, I*, 59). It must be noted here that the Lichhavis had been from the very beginning a republican community, a characteristic which they did not relinquish even after migrating wholesale to Nepal. Manadeva I was the first monarch under the new constitution and as such he naturally adopted royal titles and issued coins in his name. That he took a very modest beginning in deference to the long standing tradition of his people is illustrated in the way he addressed himself. The more grandiloquent forms of addresses had not yet been deemed as proper epithets for the ruler of the democratic country and *nripati*, a word, which as Jayaswal says conveys a lesser dignity, was still in vogue. Only at the time of Vasantadeva, his grandson, the pompous titles appear to be in use, probably significant of the growing ideal of absolute kingship adopted in his time when the democratic constition had already received the death warrant.

From the time the impact of Guptan cultural inroads was felt in Kathmandu, the oldest structure of tribal democracy collapsed, but not to the extent to have been completely put out of work, as monarchs had not yet ceased to respect popular feeling even in their most absolutist days. It might be that the new feature introduced under the influence of Guptan ideology tended to resemble despotism with the most concentrated power in a single individual, but there was always uppermost the thought of promoting the popular well-being in the minds of the rulers.

and dread of the past tradition which certainly limited that absolutism, although obedience to precepts of benevolence was voluntary rather than ordained by any sort of democratic and legal usage. To the credit o the despots of those days we have it that they had even restored fallen republics and respected the decision of the local assemblies as the Guptas did in case of the Malwa principalities.

Examples of how the local assemlies were not ignored by the Nepalese autocrats are provided by very many references to decrees in the names of Kings who had strictly prohibited official encroachment on the jurisdiction of such assemblies. It appears from these that the head of the village was always consulted on matters affecting the well-being of the inhabitants, and the village assembly was addressed in very respectable terms (Sanga, Levi, III, p. 100). This term amply shows the difference with which the ruler considered the privileges attached to democratic institutions. The king, however, was absolute in his sphere of action and responsibility, could even supercede the assemblies and legally constituted criminal and civil courts, and ask for gratuitous service compulsorily on occasions he chose—those definite limitations on individual liberty, which happen to be the contributions of the Guptan system of absolutism.

The so-called Lichhavi character of the Nepal constitution

Dr. K. P. Jayaswal, the eminent author of Hindu Polity, has more than once referred to the Lichhavi constitution as the origin of the Nepalese Government in general, and of the present structure of administration of this country in particular. He is of the opinion that the form of *dwairajya,* by which he meant the existence of the two executive heads corresponding to the Lichhavi Raja and Uparaja is peculiarly fitted so as to conform to the social texture of a country with juristic notion of the Mitakshara family. But it is difficult to conceive as to how the particular ideas affecting the joint family system and its harmonious adjustment can have a bearing on the character of Government and that least of all of a Lichhavi type. The *dwairajya* implies either a division of territory with separate administrative machineries, which may be friendly or inimical or a division of functions in the same Government without equality of power but with a nominal identity of status

as was the case in Nepal in the time of the Thakuris of the later period. Ordinarily as the principle of the joint family system would decree the dwairajya may convey the idea of an undivided holding of powers of government by the members in equal position, but in all cases the results had been either a joint regency without sovereignty or alternate sharing of power, two common characteristics of the position obtaining during the same period of Nepalese history. The form of Government then or even thereafter had no resemblance with the Lichhavi constitution which had definitely a republican background having an electoral head, and elected executive council. The Raja and Uparaja enjoyed power by the willing consent of the people who under the system are taken as the ultimate sovereign. But the position is entirely reverse in any other case where regency or joint holding of kingship by one or more persons prevails. Here the people are the dumb spectators having only one choice before them that of tamely submitting to the pretentions of divinity to which the rulers lay claim by virtue of their illustrious birth. Amshuvarman or any other person in his capacity would not easily allow himself to be subjected to the caprices of popular vote, as their ascendancy had never been a matter of public choice.

We do not know how Jayaswal mistook the present administrative structure of Nepal to be a peculiar development of the Lichhavi constitution merely on the basis of the double kingship prevalent as a common feature of both. In fact the experiment in this direction was not confined to a single system, but covered many such as suited the temperament and genius of the age. Nor the various stages of political progress and the different phases of structural development were exclusively Nepalese peculiar to this country. We have found that even the present governmental machinery has nothing exceptional to call it a Nepalese mould. The position of the king may look somewhat anomalous, but as he has been virtually overshadowed by the Prime Minister, the anomaly dissolves itself, on the other hand as far as the relationship with the British Government is concerned, the latter had acted like an Indian Prince with the British given title of His Highness' so that his loyalty to the British was the more pronounced. There is no sharing of power whatsoever with the figure head on the throne. Likewise, the Maharaja Premier has come to assume gradually the same dignity and royalty as by the king him-

self. If it were not, therefore, for the nominal allegiance which he pays to the throne, the Premier would have singly passed as the real sovereign of the country.

There is no similarity between the dwairajya type of government and a democratic Lichhavi constitution and also between the form and spirit of the working of the two.

The Nepalese idea of kingship as we have noted is Guptan in origin though it would be a mistake to suppose that the development in later times travelled in the line of Guptan ideology. The political constitution depended on traditional conception only to a certain extent and is mainly subjected to the ideas of times to a great extent, according to which it is finally shaped. The constitutional development in Nepal similarly followed that course. Admittedly it has never embodied any single force. The dictatorship of Amshuvarman and the regency in the time of the Mallas were only the respective products of their times. Nothing was common between these two Governments and between them and the Lichhavi Government. While in one the dictator was supreme and assumed the royal position later, in the other the regents were real rulers behind the puppets although for a long time the function and power of the executive was all along being centered on a single authority. It was in both a case of complete eclipse of a lesser figure by a greater figure, wherein no feasibility of identical power was conceived. There is absolutely no ground to compare them with the Lichhavi executive heads.

The worst part of Jay al's thesis has appeared with regard to the comparison he institutes between the present political structure of Nepal and the ancient Lichhavi Republic. All admit that there is no trace of the working of any republican constitution in this country since the Kiratas ceased to function as rulers. The fact that the Lichhavis had abandoned their politics as a result of Guptan ideological influence explains the growth of absolutism in the country hitherto republican in the main structure. The present Government of Nepal is as absolute as any feudal dictatorship and claims the power on the basis of hereditary rights as well as offices and functions thereof. The Government apparently consists of two heads no doubt and perhaps this led Dr.

Jayaswal to build his thesis, but we must know that of the two sovereigns one is as emasculated in power as the other is the real man to wield it. And there is no basis of a theory to identify them as to real position, if we take into consideration the actuality of situation. The Maharajadhiraja is only a figure head having not even formal courtesy functions, worse than the Maratha King in the Pesnwait period. The real ruler is the Maharaja who apparently passes as the Premier, but combines in himself all the duties of a Premier de jure and the king de facto. As he holds his power by virtue of hereditary rights, the mass of people have looked upon him as their sovereign in the same way as they looked to the other head.

At one place above we have said that Vr'sadeva was a contemporary of Samudra Gupta. About this Vr'sadeva however, we have a record supplied by one inscription of Manadeva, which gives a genealogy commencing with his name. There is yet another inscription, that of Jayadeva II, which gives the same list with the addition of three more names including that of Manadeva, the author of the earlier inscription. As Manadeva figures in both in similar order of chronology there is not the least doubt that the reference is to one and the same person, and according to the same he is the son and successor of Dharmadeva and an ancestor of Jayadeva. The date of Manadeva of Ins. No. I and No. 15 is a very important topic of ascertainment, and any conclusion arrived at in this connection wiil be a determining factor for all other successive events and chronology. In the following pages we have attempted to discuss the point in detail with reference to all relevant data available.

Before proceeding to consider the data of the inscriptions, let us deal with the genealogy of the chronicles for this period. In the list which follows we find that this part of the chronology is divided between two dynasties, the one a continuation of the early Sooryavansis, and the other entirely a new line of Kings called the Thakuris. The latter is headed by Amshuvarman whose reignal date has been indubitably ascertained with reference to Yuan Chwang's observation. As Amshuvarman's reign finds an elaborate dis-

course in the new chapter, we will devote the next article to the Soorya-bansis.

The *Sooryavansis*[18] are listed as follows by Kirkpatrick and Wright :

	Kirkpatrick.	*Wright.*
(a) 1.	Chandravarman	Bhumivarman as in K.
2.	Jayavarman	Chandrama
3.	Brishvarman	Varshvarma
4.	Sarvavarman	as in K.
5.	Puthivarman	as in K.
6.	Jeestvarman	as in K.
7.	Kubervarman[19]	Harivarma
8.	Harivarman	Kuveravarma
9.	Siddhivarman[20]	as in K.
10.	Basudutta or Basudevavarman	
11.	Shripatty or Pativarman	
12.	Shivabridhivarman[21]	

After the 12 earlier names are given, the successors whose names are in the chronology stand in the following manner (Levi. II, pp. 92-93) :

(b) 1.	Brishadeva	Brishadevavarman Shankardeva
2.	Sankaradeva	Dharmodeva (varman affix is dropped
3.	Dharamdeva	Manadeva
4.	Manadeva	
5.	Basantdeva	
		Vasantdeva varma

18 Kirkpatrick, p. 260.
Wright, pp. 113-16. His list is most confusing. Kirkpatrick's authority is more or less a reliable one with one correction.
Jayaswal. p. 196 ff. Levi II. 92. Bhagwanlal. IA, XIII. 413.

19 He belongs to the list of Prabhakaravarman given earlier.

20 He has been identified with Shivadeva I who is wrongly mentioned immediately after and Basantdeo is wrongly repeated.

21 This list leaves out Haradatta to whom the four Narayan temples and Buddha Nilkantha are attributed by other chronicles (Wright p. 313)

This part of the list does not find a separate place in Wright (p. 313). Vasantadeva, Shivadeva and Rudradeva follow immediately after Shivabridhi according to the same authority.

(c)	Udyadeva	Udyadeva Varma
8.	Manadeva	Manadeva Varma
9.	Gunakamadeva	Gunakamadeva Varma
10.	Sivadeva Varman	,,
11.	Narendradeva Varman	,,
12.	Bhimadeva Varman	These three names are omitted by
13.	Visnudeva Varman	Levi.
14.	Viswadeva Varman	

The Thakuri Dynasty.

Wright also puts the names of 7 to 14 of the above as predecessors of Amshuvarman but with him, the author begins a new dynasty of the Thakuris.

While considering the names in the above list we have to be careful to avoid confusion as regards the amalgamation of the diverse families of rulers which the chronicier has not thought fit to classify separately.

This long list in the genealogy supplied by the chronicles suffers from many inaccuracies of names and of the order of succession. For a correct chronology we will have to recast the whole list in accordance with the more reliable estimate of inscriptions and like records, which we have done in the following pages.

As the list (a) is for the period already dealt with we proceed to consider the (b) and (c) lists which give names for the period between the Gupta age and the accession of Amshuvarman two centuries later.

The list (c) is very much confusing, apart from the fact that the list preceding has again been misplaced as to occur just before Udayadeva. We have repetitions of names like Manadeva and Shivadeva, and the order of succession in these as verified by other data appears to have no relation with facts. At the very outset we face the problem of

identification of the names repeated and to determine whether they stand for one person or several. Jayaswal has identified Shivabridhivarman of the list (a) with Shivadeva I of inscriptions, a contemporary of Amshuvarman whose date is a matter of certainty in view of Yuan Chwang's observation. Manadeva in another list who is to be regarded as a predecessor of Shivadeva, is the first Nepalese King of that according to the same author, and he has also accepted the existence of two more persons bearing the same name. But as many other points are still not cleared off Jayaswal's finding is not whol.y conclusive. Let us take the question of Manadeva's identification. We have three rulers of that name as also accepted by Jayaswal. The one who is referred to in a copy of the *Sumatitantra* in possession of the Rajguru of Nepal has an ascertained regnal date in his favour, thus rendering identification almost factual[22]. Unlike the copy in the British Museum, the Rajguru's unpublished work notes Manadeva's reign in the year 498 Saka, which has again been connected with the Nepal era by an anotator to fix it in the year 304. The Saka 498 is 576 A. D., which corresponds to the same year exactly in terms of the Nepal Era 880-304 thal is 576 A. D. This is really a new discovery on one of the much debatable part of ancient Nepalese chronology, but can it be a fact that this Manadeva is the first ruler of that name in the Nepalese history? The identification of another Manadeva, contemporary of Jisnu Gupta is also a difficult proposition although his reign period with reference to Jisnu's inscription is again a settled fact. About Manadeva of *Sumatitantra* there is not much divergence of opinion as on either argument, he comes to occupy the middle or the first position, which can be adduced without breaking the identity between the names concerned. But about the other two there is much confusion on account of the divergence of eras to which their inscription have been variously referred. Our task here will be, therefore, to determine the exact epoch of the earlier inscriptions and their relation with reference to the names in the Vansabalis, so that we can fix regnal dates for the rulers occurring in the list of these inscriptions.

22 Jayaswal, Ch. Cit., pp. 193-95; catalogue of British Museum pp. 193-94, 467 No. 3564.

Inscriptions :—These are five in all, three of Manadeva, one of Vasantadeva and one of Ganadeva. According to Javaswal, all these inscriptions have followed the epoch of the Gupta era of 320 A. D. This was also the view put forth by Dr. Fleet. Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji who has been closely followed by recent writers like Dr. R. G. Basak and others referred them, however, to the Vikrama Era of 57 B. C. We have, therefore, here a fundamedtal difference of opinion as to the epoch of the era adopted in these inscriptions. If Gupta era were to be accepted Manadeva and his successors who have found mention in Jayadeva II's inscription (No. 15 of IA, IX) must be placed after the seventh century A. D. otherwise according to Indraji, they occupy a place in the fourth century A. D. As this is the central point of the theme we must proceed now with the consideration of the inscriptions concerned.

(1) The Changnnarayan inseription of Mandeva. It is dated Samvat 386. Its importance lies in the fact of the list which has given a chronology of the author's predecessors. The names are successively—Vr'sadeva, Shankaradeva and Dharmadeva. The place of issue is not mentioned. The epigraphy of the inscription according to Dr. Indraji is early Guptan.

(2) The inscription of Jayavarman incised in the reign of Manadeva, wherein is written *Shri Manadeva Nripate Prasadat.* It is dated Samvat 413.

(3) Issued by Basantasena from Managriha. The author addresses himself as *Maharaj.* The dutaka is *Sarbdanda Nayak Mahaprathihara Rabi Gupta.* It is undated.

(4) Another one incised on a stone slab with dutaka *Rajputtra Vikramsena.* The author is not known. It is dated S. 535.

The (3) and (4) of the series refer to the royal personages so far unidentified. It is possible that Vasantasena is the same personage as Vasantadeva of Ins. No. 15 (IA, p. 178), son and successor of Manadeva who succeeded Manadeva of Ins. No. 1. There can not be any doubt about Mahideva's being a son of Manadeva, for the genealogy of Ins I tallies in toto with that of Ins. No. 15, which has

given a list of the earlier Lichhavis. As the latter inscription makes it clear that these were descendants of the first Lichhavi Supuspa, we can easily adduce as to Manadeva's Lichhavi paternity, although his inscription do not refer to it.

The date of Manadeva

Who is Manadeva I, the one of *Sumatitantra* or of Ins. No. I ? We will find later that there is not much to say about Jisnu's contemporary Manadeva, because after ascertainment of the epoch year of Ins. No. I we can easily determine his place in the order which will be second or third and anything else but not the first and last. Similarly Manadeva of *Sumatitantra* will come to occupy the first or second position on the same basis, as his date is no more subjected to doubt. The most controversial point therefore, under discussion is the identification of the person in the inscription no. I with reference to his date. But this has become a subject of much controversy in view of the lack of unanimity of opinion on the epoch year of the eras the inscription has adopted. Dr. Jayaswal while recognising the validity of the legend of *Mananka and Gunanka* in the coinage of Nepal attributes the same to Manadeva of 576 A. D. whom he gives the first place in the order (JBORS. op. cit)[23]. As to the epigraphic evidence he dismisses it as entirely valueless for reasons of the many irregular and indistinct features in the epigraphy of the coinage. He also fails to note the dissimilarity in the epigraphy of the inscription in question and of those of the 7th century A. D., to which period he assigns the list of names occurring in the inscription no. I. Levi and Indraji agree as to the defective language the inscription of Manadeva and his successors contain and as also to the difference in the epigraphy of this inscription and Amshuvarman's inscriptions, which shows definitely certain alteration in orthography to approach the Gupta character of the later period (Levi, iii, p. 83 ff.). If Amshuvarman's inscriptions might have preceded them there is no reason that Manadeva's inscriptions should betray the defects common to the epigraphy of the earlier centuries. Dr. Jayaswal again asserts that the Thakuris of the scion of Amshuvarman ruled over Nepal during the latter part of the 7th century A. D.

23 Some authors have read in these coins Kushan resemblance in matters of structure and image.

and the Lichhavis were their vassals, a fact which according to him accounts for the existence of these inscriptions along with records of the Thakuri rulers. He argued that Manadeva's assumption of a less dignified title is significant of his comparatively less important role under the Thakuris. This, however, is not a valid assumption, for the word '*Nripati*' carried as much a sense of high royal dignity as the word *Maharaja*. Kumara Gupta I is referred to with that title and, therefore, it would not be wrong to infer that Manadeva was as independent as his successor or predecessors so far as the evidence of this inscription is concerned[24]. It is quite possible, as we alluded to before, that *Nripati* was adopted in view of the past political affiliation of the Lichhavis, which was definitely democratic. Besides that, this inscription also is silent as regards the place of issue, unlike the one which characterises the successive records. If the ruling family would have been occcupying Managriha, there is no reason that Managriha should be omitted. Managriha had not ceased to wear the dignity of the royal palace in the seventh century or even in the eighth, for we have inscriptions issued from that place for that period (cf. IA, ix, p 167). But if we push off the date of Manadeva of Ins. No. 1 to 705 or so this is just the position the evidence disproves. The absence of Managriha in this inscription or in any other of the same order can only mean that this place did not exist while the epigraphy was being recorded. The place most probably originated posthumously with Manadeva of this inscription, who as will appear subsequently is the first Manadeva of the Lichhavi dynasty, his date being pushed back to 4th century.

There is an expression in the Inscription No. 15 (IA, ix, p 178), which has led to much confusion in relation to the date of Manadeva of Ins. 1. This expression consists of a compound '*asyantare*' which ordinarily means at the interval of. Fleet and Jayaswal have interpreted it as to mean the interval of time when the Thakuris were ruling jointly or individually and make the whole list down to Vasantadeva contemporaneous with Narendradeva's successors as mentioned in the lines following that expression in the inscription, and at the same

24. G. I, Chandra Gupta I calls himself Mabaraja in Radhapur plates (J A.S.B. 1924, p 58 ff).

time giving Thakuri parentage to these rulers. The chronicles have omitted Udyadeva who precedes the second list and who on the basis of the above interpretation should be a contemporary of Vr'sadeva. By placing the latter as a contemporary of Narendradeva a possible way of escape has been found. But as we have observed earlier, this is inadmissible and the expression would clearly indicate either the priority over or the contemporaneity with Udayadeva or Vr'sddeva and in no case with Narendradeva. Further the T'ang history has no mention of the other Lichhavi King ruling in the valley in the reign of Narendradeva if at all Narendradeva's dynasty were to be accepted as Thakuri. Nor it can be true that Dharmadeva killed the Tibetan king in 705 A.D[25]. The inscription No. 1 and No. 15 do not mention him as such and had he been instrumental in defeating the Tibetan and this was no ordinary occasion but was an event of unusual importance marking the end of a foreign rule, his valour should have unfailingly found reference in that connection. But according to inscription No. 1 it seems he himself met disaster in some battlefield and it was not a fight with Bhotta, which makes the whole basis of that inference very weak. By no stretch of imagination the list common to Ins. No. 1 and No. 15 can be a contemporary of Udayadeva and his successors.

Those who tried to explain the anomaly of the situation have taken shelter behind an argument that Udayadev is not of the Lichhavi dynasty. As we have just noted, this point alone is insufficient to meet the requirement of the argument in favour of the Gupta epoch of the inscriptions, apart from the incongruous result it leaves in regard to Vr'sadeva's time. But the foremost question which puzzles us is whether omission of Amshuvarman's name in that list is justifiable, while the genealogy of the inscription (No. 15) proudly mentions the Lichhavi list, which according to this view was not the dynasty of the chronicler (Jayadeva II). Amshuvarman as the founder of the Thakuri dynasty and the immediate predecessor of Udayadeva deserved naturally, at least, a mention

---

25. G. I., 186-87. If we refer the inscription to the Gupta era, the date for Vr'sadeva will come to the year 705 A.D., the year which according to the Tang annal saw the defeat of Tibet by Nepal.

in the chronicle which was composed by his son.[26] The fact that he did not figure in the inscription proves that Jayadeva II did not belong to Amshu's dynasty. In the other case the reference could not have been avoided. Nor what Fleet says as regards the different stock of Udayadeva's Thakuri line can alter the premises in any way, for even then one does not see any reason for the omission of a prominent personage like Amshuvarman Thakuri, while at the same time we find that the Lichhavis who were in no way allied with the Thakuris have received honourable place there. The inscriptions of Sivadeva II style him as the illustrious Lichhavi (Levi, iii, p 105) and also shows that the seat of the king was no longer Kailashakuta, another fact which certainly indicates a break with the past and a change in the status of the sovereign, probably significant of the Tibetan domination of the last fifty years and its withdrawal in 705 A.D.[27].

No purpose would be served by attributing these factors to a desire on the part of the later Thakuris to be called the Lichhavis, because the Lichhavis themselves by that time had fallen into disrepute or at least into insignificant position in other parts of India and secondly because the Thakuri dynasty was as much respectable in view of the pinnacle of glory Amshuvarman pushed it to, apart from the fact that the name of Amshuvarman, as one of the greatest kings of his time, imparted honour rather than disgrace to be remembered by his descendants. Udayadeva's Thakuri paternity is therefore an impossibility and it is also absurd to deny the Lichhavi character of Jayadeva II's genealogy.

The interval of time as conveyed by the expression 'asyantare' should be understood with reference to the following lines of kings headed by Udayadeva, who was the thirteenth successor of Vasantadeva. The interval shown here constitutes a long line of twelve kings intervening between Vasantadeva and Udayadeva. This is clearly

26. Jayaswal takes him as Amshu's direct successor and his son. Levi (ii, p 169), however, regards him as a Lichhavi.

27. In the writing of Ins, No. 15 Udayadeva and Narendradeva have been mentioned to belong to the line of Jayadeva, the Lichhavi king.

intended by the words coming after in the next quarter of the verse[28]. The reading, however, has been much controversial; Bhagwanlal Indraji reads '*Jata: troyodasatotascha Narender Deo*' to take Udayadeva as the immediate successor of Vasantadeva and places him twelve generations previous to Naredradeva, which in fact he is not as his priority over the latter is generally admitted. The exact reading is rendered difficult owing to the illegible letters in between *Jata* and *Narendra* But as *ya* after *na* is very clear, the reading *troyodasa* has a greater chance of reception.

Besides the whole construction making Narendradeva as the son of Udayadeva without trying to explain the 'ya' after 'na' is ill fitting with the harmony of the whole verse and is only forcibly thrust in the context despite ugly adjustment. The right reading is most probably '*jat troyodasa sutascha Narander Deo*' so that Udayadeva becomes the thirteenth ruler of the second Lichhavi list. The eleven kings preceding him were omitted on the ground that they had not the independent existence to have been honourably noted. According to the Chinese history, the date for Udayadeva corresponds to 638 or 39 A.D. The period before him was full of turmoil. The dynasty then in power was the Thakuri dynasty which itself seized power from the Ahirs. The Manjusri history in the particular instance has supplied facts abundantly explanatory of the situation of this period. It says that Manadeva ruled for eighty years and, thereafter, the country will be subjugated by the Mlechhas and others. From a parallel account of the Vanshabalis it seems that the allusion to the various names in the list of the MMK applies to the Kirata and Gupta rule preceding Amshuvarman. These should not be construed as representing contemporary dynasties, otherwise the whole series of names up to Udayadeva including the Guptas and Amshuvarman would appear to belong to contemporary dynasties of the same period[29]. We know from the inscription that Jisnu Gupta was a successor of Amshuvarman, but on the authority of Fleet and Jayaswal, Vr'sadeva and others also did follow Amshu, which seems quite a contradictory estimate

28. Basak, op. cit., pp. 280-83; I.A., ix, p. 178, Another reading, is *jat tata nam namyost Narander Deo.*

29. Jayaswal wrongly takes them as contemporaries.

of the MMK's clear assertion. The verse now in question has, however, clearly put the names one after the other, which indicates the order of their succession and not their contemporaneity and the fact that Udayadeva and Jisnu Gupta are placed in the last order is what would confirm the above view. There is no doubt that the MMK by its references beckons to a turbulent state of affairs in the reigns following the list of six names, of which Manadeva's with his three epigraphic records is the most famous. Accordingly, Udayadeva and not Vr'sadeva is the next ruler after Amshuvarman, so that the whole list of Ins. No. 1 should be transferred to the earlier period.

The eighty years of Manadeva I should not mean the reign of a single monarch. The whole comprises also the two reigns following him. After a few years' rule by the successors of Vasantadeva, the valley was invaded by the Kiratas led by Vabisha whose successor Subhasu was dethroned by the Guptas. Bhakrama was the first ruler of this dynasty. About this Bhakrama nothing can be said but the next one *Prakrama*, can be identified with Parama Gupta of the chronicle. The list according to MMK is as follows:—

I. Bhakrama 2. Parakrama 3. Kamala 4. Bhagupta 5. Batsaka.

The list of course includes a few unimportant names as well, which are also given in the Vansabali. These five rulers including the four Kiratas ruled in regular order of succession until the last of them was subdued by Amshuvarman. Including Amshuvarman and Dhruvadeva we have, therefore eleven rulers between Vasantadeva and Udayadeva, which agrees also with the numerical strength of the inscription No. 15 Accordingly, Manadeva of Sumatitantra must fall in that line of unnamed kings though he seems to have initiated the period of Lichhavi regeneration in his time.

We have another evidence corroborating our conclusion and that is the coinage of this period variously dalled Mananka, Gunanka and Batsanka. The coins of this period have two especial features. First, they follow quite closely the structure of the Kushan coinage (Walsh, J.R A.S.M, 1908, p. 677). The deity on a lotus seat in both the Mananka and Huviska coins (CCIMC, i, p 82) and also the

elephant facing the right are pictured in both. But another feature reveals an imitation of the legend of Guptan coinage and there seems to be very close affinity between the Nepalese coinage of this period and the Guptan coinage (Levi, ii, p 108). The *Sri Bhogini*, the deity of Mananka coins, agrees in toto with the same expression used as epithet for Manadeva I by the MMK. Bendal confusing Sri Bhogini for Sri Bhagini whom he took for Amshu's sister attributed the coin to Amshuvarman (Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft, Leipzig, 1882, vol, xxxvi, p 51). But now on correct reading it has been ascertained that the expression applies to the goddess seated on the lotus[30]. Prof. Rapson identifies the Mananka* coin as that of Manadeva I[14], who is definitely the author of Ins. No. 1, the Lichhavi prince.

Now if Amshuvarman's time be fixed in c 624 A. D. according to one of his inscriptions, the Kirata revival seems to have accurred during a period at least, 184 years before him, so that the last date of Vasantadeva would be the year 624-184-460 A. D. The first date of Manadeva I in this way would come to 410 A. D. or near about that date, which is supported by the coinage of the period with a close resemblance to its prototype of Guptan image and structure.

The date for Manadeva of inscription No. 1 cannot, therefore, fall in the 7th century A. D. as argued by certain scholars. He comes, definitely to occupy the first position so far as the regnal year of the rulers of the same name is concerned. As according to our reading of inscription No. 15 the six names previous to Udayadeva are to be put somewhere in the fourth century A. D., twelve generations earlier to 640 A. D., their repetition in the Ins. No. 1 has made it easy for us to refer the epoch year of the era of Ins. No. 1 to a date in that period. The moot point in controvery can likewise be settled with the first place assigned to Manadeva of Ins. No. 1, whom hence forward we designate as Manadeva the First. Manadeva of Sumatitantra should again be identified as the second repeated in the chronology.

Now from the same it is clear that the continuity of the line

30. J.A.S.B., March 1888, article on the Nepalese coinage.

31. Indian coins, 1898, p 32.

of Lichhavi Kings was maintained without any wide breach, as even in the worst days of the dynasty it was only interrupted for a period covering not more than two or three generations except at the initial stage when it seems to have been overshadowed by foreign rulers for a century and half. The genealogical order of the chronicle giving an unduly long list of names and dynasties is now proved *to be a complete myth.*

The Era of the Earlier Inscriptions

From the above it is now proved that the epoch of the earlier inscriptions must agree with some year in the first century A. D., by which alone we can make Manadeva's reign contemporaneous with the Gupta period[32]. We have M. Levi's Lichhavi Era of 110 A. D., which he obtained by attributing the phenomenon of the inscription No. I (Levi, iii, pp 48,49) to the first day of May of 496 A. D.[33] He also has tried to justify his stand by a reference to another inscription (No. vi, pp 48-70), which has shown an intercalation in the month of Asadha of the year 449 of an unknown era but which he says has followed the year 110 A. D , as the epoch year, as to him the phenomenon in the corresponding year 559 A. D. appears of like nature. But the epoch of the era thus ascertained is too far removed, as on no account the epoch can be placed after 66 A. D. From the inscriptions of Shivadeva I and Dhruvadeva, we have samvat 520 preceding samvat 48 by at least thirty years. The epoch of the latter inscription falls on the year 595 A. D. and according to this calculation, the corresponding year for 48 is c. 643 A. D. just 350 years after Jaya deva I and the corresponding year for 520 is c. 613 A.D. or so, so that the epoch of the latter may find its place in the year 93 A. D. or near about that date. But as there is no intercalation in the vicinity of that year, we have to go back for the search to a year which agrees with both. Further, Levi's reading of Shivadeva's inscription has been partly defective as he has read 5 in place of 3, which would confuse the whole situation. It will serve no useful purpose in con-

32. According to Fleet, 28 April 705 A.D., G.I. Text, p 195.

33. Dr. Indraji supported by C. V. Vaidya and R. G. Basak refers them to the Vikrama Era (Basak, p 275).

necting the two sets of inscriptions. The intercalation of the year 449 may be interpreted to correspond to the year 483 A. D., so that Manadeva himself of Ins. No. 1 would be placed in the period between 403 A. D. and 447 A. D. just 30 years after Jayadeva I [34], whom we may assign the very earliest year of the Lichhavi settlement. On this calculation the epoch of the era would be the year 34 A. D. The following is the probable datum for the reigns of Vr'sadeva and his successors :—

Vr'sadeva	...	... 325 A.D.——350 A.D.
Shankaradeva	...	... 350 A.D.——375 A.D.
Dharmadeva	...	... 375 A.D.——403 A.D.
Manadeva I	...	... 403 A.D.——447 A.D.
Mahideva	...	... 447 A.D.——449 A.D.
Vasantadeva	...	... 449 A.D.——460 A.D.
Ganadeva	...	... 482 A.D.——

Confusions of the Chronology

The Vansabali has made confusion worse confounded in three places. In the first it has made unwarranted transposition of names from one list to another. Secondly, some contemporary rulers are put in order of succession as seemingly to have ruled not simultaneously but successively one after the other. Thirdly, the transposition has been done at the cost of corresponding dates established by the inscription No. 15. The five names headed by Vr'sadeva have to be adjusted in the way we have arranged in the above connection according to Levi's authority. Udayadeva should have followed Amshuvarman but in the list of the chronicle precedes him, thus necessitating the transference of the whole list of succession to Vasantadeva. One name Vasantadeva is twice repeated, Shivadeva I's place is antidated. Gunakama Deva who comes after Manadeva II in the list of the chronicle should follow Vasantadeva. The order of the next two Shivadeva and Narendradeva should have been reversed, on the other hand these are repeated *ad nauseam* in the fictitious list of the Thakuris. Visnudeva Varman and Viswadeva Varman should have gone to the

34. There is no intercalation in Sambat 449 on both counts, Vikram or Saka.

Gupta chronology. Manadeva of Sumatitantra is definitely the second of the kind, identified as Manadeva II whose regnal year should come just previous to Shivadeva I.

The Ahir Guptas

The Goala or Ahir dynasty of Nepal is placed at the beginning of the Nepalese history. These kings as having the Guptan appendage after their names have been traced to the Gupta chronology and according to Dr. Jayaswal they form only a branch of the Imperial Guptas.

Their position in the history, however. has been wrongly antidated. The Gupta influence dates in the fourth century A. D. and, therefore, there is absolutely no ground to push them off to the period previous to the Lichhavis. They must come sometime after the fourth century A. D. as confirmed by the MMK, which depicts a stage of anarchy after Manadeva II and a situation mainly dominated by these Guptas.

Though M. Levi and others have tried to dismiss the existence of this dynasty as a mere chronological figment, we have from the MMK and from several other sources reliable evidence as to their inhabitation and rule in the valley. We have also references to some Gupta personages in Nepalese inscriptions (IA, ix. p 16 ff).

The question now to be discussed is, are they a branch of the Imperial Guptas? On this question Jayaswal's learned opinion is most conclusive. The only point we like to add here is that the chronicler has further clarified the position by the caste distinction of the Guptas as Ahirs, which not only supports the identification between the two lines but also confirms the nature of the caste of the Imperial Guptas who have been mentioned as Ahir or Abhirs in the Indian Chronologies.

The kinetic identification rests also on the close resemblance of the coinage of the two stocks, the expression being noticeable in the images as Garuda in the coin of Jaya Gupta, which is significant of their Guptan origin and an acknowledgement of that to a common emblem (JBORS, 1936, iii, p 244).

Fleet has calculated the first date for the dynasty taking the initial year of the Gupta era and adding to it 88, which is calculated as

407-08 A. D. Our calculation, however, has shown that the dynasty must have come to power sometime in the fifties of the fifth century A. D. which are the probable dates for Vasantadeva and his sucossor, in whose inscription the Gupta personages figure as important officers of the State[35].

Bhumi Gupta seems to be the same person as Bhugupta whose name the MMK has noted. He might be an earlier contemporary of Amshuvarman and according to Kirkpatrick's authority his son and successor was the last ruler of this line. The chronicle mentions the present day little village of Matatirtha on the north west ridge of the valley as the capital of the Ahir Guptas.

According to chronology the following is the list of kings belonging to this dynasty, who preceded Bhugupta :—

Parama Gupta	...	... C. 500 A.D.
Harsa Gupta	...	... C. 525 A D.
Mani Gupta	...	... C. 550 A.D.
Visnu Gupta	...	... C. 575 A.C.
Yaksa Gupta—Jaya Gupta II (K)		... 590 A.D.

Parama Gupta is identified with Parakrama of MMK, who wrested power from the Lichhavis. His grandson Bhisma Gupta had two sons, one of whom ruled from Simraongarh, twenty miles south east of Raxaul. The other son Visnu Gupta had to leave the Nepal valley under pressure of invasion by Manadeva II identified with the one of Sumatitantra, but the final expulsion of the dynasty took place some years later at the hands of Manadeva's successor. There was a short lived revival under Yaksa Gupta who is identified with Vatsaka of MMK. There is also a coin with the legend Vaisravana, which is ascribed to Yaksa Gupta. The coin which has the image of a man with a bull has, on all opinions, been declared to have belonged to Pre-Amshuvarman era and therefore to the reign of Yaksa Gupta.

35. I.A., XIV, p 345, *Bhuktman Guptabarsh* and not *Guptnam Jatvarsh* according to Fleet, signifies the calculation according to Gupta era. Levi regards the earlier Gupta as mere fictitious names (ii, p 158).

There was another line of the same dynasty seated in the Terai, which had branched off from the main line since the time of Jisnu Gupta. Its foremost representative was Jaya Gupta II whose coins, gold and copper, were dug out from the ruins in Champaran. These coins give inscriptions in Guptan character of the age of Harsa. A clay mould also has been traced to him out of the Nalanda excavated store (JBORS, ibid, P 215).

The chronicles give yet one more line of three rulers following Jaya Gupta II. It is not at all improbable in view of the coins of Varasinha available in the Terai that Jaya Gupta's dynasty was superceded by that of Varasimha. It may be that this line continued to rule in the Terai up to the accession of Amshuvarman to power, who finally liquidated the Gupta dynasty.

CHAPTER III

Amshuvarman and his successors.

A DYNASTIC HISTORY OF NEPAL IN THE 7TH & 8TH CENTURIES A. D.

SOURCES

For the history of Nepal up till the time of Amshuvarman we have to wholly depend on a weak structure of insufficiently proved evidence supplied by the confusing data of various inscriptions and exaggerated and contradictory accounts of local legends. The reign of Amshuvarman, however, can be established by correct historical references from the contemporary accounts of Yuan Chwang and from locally traced inscriptions, which are nevertheless conclusive and, therefore, there is all truth in the statement that his date is a pivot to move up and down for several centuries[1].

From local evidence gathered through inscriptions, of himself and Shivadeva I [2], Amshuvarman is known as early as Samvat 30 as the contemporary of the latter and as his Mahasamanta (High Feudatory). The last of the series of such inscriptions have indicated also a changed status, popularly ascribed to his royalty which he assumed towards the end of his reign. But the epoch of these inscriptions is still being wrongly attributed to Harsa era in complete ignorance or disregard of foreign evidence, which has confused the main basis of Amshuvarman's history. We have now to see how the reference to Harsa era or any other era is resting on weak grounds.

According to views ascribing the epoch to 606-07 A. D[3]., to which almost all the authors[4] up till now with the exception of M. Levi and Jayaswal have unanimously subscribed, the following causes supply sufficient grounds for not taking it as otherwise :—

1 K. P. Jayaswal, JBORS, 1936, III, p 161

2 IA, IX, PP 170-78 ; Levi, iii, PP 61-69

3 Read the following for Harsa era Bunningham, Indian Eras, PP 64ff, 157ff ; Fleet, Gupta Inscriptions (CII, III), P 178.

4 IA, XIII, 412ff: xiv, PP 349ff; Basak, History of N. E. India, PP239-302 ; H. C. Rai, Dynastic History of India vol I pp. 78692.

(1) The account of the Vamsabali (chronology) purports that Vikramaditya conquered Nepal just before Amshuvarman founded the Thakuri dynasty, which must be an indirect allusion to Harsa's conquest of Nepal[1].

(2) According to the same authority we have the existence of the Vaisya Rajput dynasty at Nawakot in connection with his lineage, which must be taken to show Harsa's establishment of his kinsmen in the hills after his victory over the Lichhavis. The word Panchalika in his inscriptions is a reference to his origin from Panchala[2].

(3) Sri Harsa was a Vaisya Rajput as also confirmed by Yuanch-wang who calls him Feshe and therefore Amsuvarman, a Vaisya Rajput, must be his relative and nominee to the throne in Nepal[3].

(4) The passage in *Harsa char tam* of Banabhatta which literally means the taking of Tushara Shaila is a reference to his conquest of the hill kingdom of Nepal[4].

(5) The statement of Yuan Chawang that Amshuvarman was a past sovereign is wrong and must have been based on hear-say information, as his note was taken in Vaishali and not in Nepal[5].

(6) The identity between their respective paleographs of the two rulers means that one is the subordinate of the other[6].

(7) The fact of Pausa intercalation which shows such a phenomenon only in 640 A. D. as applicable to Amshuvarman's period confirms the Harsa epoch of Amshuvarman's inscriptions from astronomical and inscriptional data[7].

---

1 Bhagwan Lal Indraji ; IA, XIII, p 420 ; Wright, P 130; Archaelogical Survey Report, i, P 280.

2 IA, ix; Levi, III; IA, X III ; Fleet, IA, XIV,

3 Vaisya as Feshi is identified by A Cunningham in his Ancient Geography of India, PP. 432-33. Also see Buhler, EP. Indica I, P 68, note 4 ; Hoernle, IP AS, 1903, P 35.

4 IA, ix, pp 342-51, GI, 177-91 ; XIII, p 420 ff.

5 IA,XIII, P 421; Levt, Le Nepal (ii,65) also believes in this assumption, though his grounds of doing so and his conclusion are different.

6 R.D. Banerji in EI, IX, PP286-87. Pannikar supports the Harsa Era in 'Sri Harsa of Kanauj' P57 (1922) V. Smith (Catalogue of Coins in the Indian museum P 280) and Ettinghansen also support the same view.

7 G. Buhler in IA, XIX, 1890, P 49. Also see the views of Prof. Schram of Vienna as quoted by him in IA, XV, p 338. He obtained the mean intercalation of the Pausa in 640 A. D., so that the epoch of the era in the inscription dating Samvat 34 (Bendal Journey, P 74) fell in 606-07 A· D.

(8) Aditya Sena, the great grand father of Jayadeva II of (S) 153, has used Harsa Era 88 and it is but natural that his grandson should have followed the same era 73 years later, which will put again Amshuvarman's inscriptions to similar position as belonging to the same series of lower dated epigraphic evidence[1].

Against the above we have the following :—

(1) The account of Vikramaditya's invasion of Nepal is quite wrong as not only no Vikramitya came to Nepal but also Harsa's conquest never extended beyond the present boundary of the Gorakhpore district. The Chronicler on whose veracity of accounts scholors have relied to suit their own convenience misinterpreted the term Samvat in Amshuvarman's inscriptions to have followed the epoch of the Vikrama Era. But even he does not mention Harsa who in his turn did not use the title of Vikramaditya[2].

(2) His settlement in the valley is equally wrong as he never visited it. On the other hand the alleged settlement of the Vaisya Rajput in the valley is anterior to Harsa's accession to power (IA, IX, PP168; Levi, III, PP 55-68). Panchalika does not indicate allusion to the region of Panchala, nor his visit to Prayag as mentioned by the Chronicle stands valid with reference to the place at the confiuence of the Ganges and Jamuna[3]. In Nepal such places of pilgrimage have only local connotation and they refer to areas inside the valley. Panchala is modern Panauti[4] and Prayag is near the pond of Godavari, six miles south east of Kathmandu. Panchalika, therefore, should be understood as meaning inhabitants of Panauti or a committee of management as rightly interpreted by Bhagwanlalji.

(3) Amshuvarman, though stated to be a Rajput by the chronicler, was not of the stock to which Sri Harsa belonged, as no reference to the Vaisya Rajput clan is made in his connection[5], while the inscriptions are silent about his lineage to dismiss any such inference.

1 Arch. Survey, Report, XV, PL XI, XVI, pp 73-76; EI, viii, P 40 for his Junagarh Inscription of 72 A. D. The above are for Aphsan Inscription.
2 EI, VIII, P313; EI, IX, III, P313; R. C. Tripathi, History of Kanauj, PP 96, 135.
3 Wright. P 133, E. A. Pires, The Maukharis, P 134.
4 Levi, II, P 144.
5 Wright, P 133.

(4) The passage in the Harsa Charitam has no other signification than what is intended for literally and there is no justification to interpret the srory as something connected with Harsa's conquest of Nepal, when we find that not only the reference is vague but it also is capable of an entirely different interpretation and perhaps the only right interpretation is the one by which Turusa may stand for the country of the Rishikas in the northwestern frontier[1].

(5) The statement of Yuan Chwang is not based on hearsay evidence, for not only there is adequate reason to support the fact of his visit in this valley but there is also no ground to disbelieve it as well as to dismiss his observation as mere hearsay, when we find in him an actual observer of things and men in all respects and it is only logical that he might have written his note on Nepal on correct information if not by personal investigation on the spot. M. Julien maintains on the basis of Siyaki's translation of the pilgrim's memoirs[2] that he visited Nepal as he has expressly omitted this country from the list of those not visited by him, which were those lying beyond Samatata[3]. Amshuvarman is referred to in his note as a King ruling just before 637 A. D., the year of Yuan Chwang's visit to Vaishali and Nepal. We have, therefore, no tenable ground to take him as alive till 645 A. D., which is the only conclusion to be arrived at, when his inscription of the year 39 is referred to the Harsa era[4]. There is yet another proof against regarding Amshuvarman as alive in 645 A. D., for in that year the T'ang Annals tell us that the ruler in Nepal was some body else 'Nalinifamo' by name, whichcertainly is not the same as 'An-chu-Famo'[5], the name used by the pilgrim for Amshuvarman[6]. Similarly the attempt to connect him with Yashodharman of Malwa must be dismissed as Amshu is referred in Yuanchwang's notes as a recent King[7].

---

1 Levi, II, pp 143-44. Also read M. Ettinghanssen 'Harsavardan et poet, 1906, P 47.

2 Julien: Memoirctome I, P 408; Beal, ii, P 81-82; I. A, ix, P 419.

3 Watters, ii, P 187; Cunningham, AGI, P 646; JRAS, xvii, P 126.

4 I A, ix, P 170.

5 Levi, i, 154-55. The statement as to Amsu's death at the time when Yuan took his note is obvious from his reference to him as a past King.

6 Levi, i, PP 160, 165, 166; ii, 165-66; I A, 1894, pp 60. 67; I A, 1900, p 304.

7 According to the author who likes to bring Narendradeva's rule in 636 A. D. and who thinks it unlikely that Narendra would have ruled for 70 years to 712 A. D., Amshuvarman began his era in 538 A. D. We have seen how fantastic this assertion is in view of the clear statement of Yuan Chwang who certainly meant Amshuvarman and he alone by the Chinese version of Ang-chu-fa-mo. For the author's views read Indian Historical Quarterly, 1933, P 308.

(6) As regards paleographic evidence not ont only the paleograph in Nepal has a retardaire characteristic, but also on R. D. Banerji's own admission it resembles much like that presented in Yasodharman's Mandsar inscription, which shows the inconclusive and deceptive nature of such evidence[1]. Paleographically rhe significance of contemporary Nepalese incriptions is much helpful and one such of Jisnu Gupta's inscriptions definitely puts his death back before 639 A. D.[2] by its reference to the former as the ruler ruling before 639 A. D. (Thankot inscription).

(7) The intercalation in Pausa must be referred to only one year, the year 629 A. D. and not to any year beyond that[3]. Bendal's calculation was based on Brahama Siddhanta (journey, P8) which according to Sewell (Siddhantas and the Indian Calendar, P X) is too farfetched as Brahmasiddhanta was of aperiod definitely post Amshuvarman and therefore cannot be said to have held the field in 629 or before. This also negatives Levi's statement that according to Brahma Siddhanta we have an intercalation in 629 A. D.,[4] for in that year we have such a phenomenon only according to the old Arya Siddhanta. If Brahma Siddhanta is brought to bear on the argument, then the inscription must be referred to make the year 34 correspond to 621 A. D. but not to 629 A. D[5]. We also have to bear in mind that ordinarily intercalary months are regarded inauspicious unless the second month is intended for the celebration of the occasion[6]. Brahma Siddhanta, therefore, was no longer followed in Nepal at that time, for we have just the very celebration in the first month contrary to what it lays down. We have, therefore to calculate the date in accordance with the old rule of Arya Siddhanta[7].

(8) Aditya Sena's inscription is entirely unrelated to the epoch of Amshu's era, for the former came after him and in circumstances quite different.

1. E I, ix, P 286-87
2. JBORS, III, P 206.
3. Levi, III, P 104, P I 17.
4. Sewell — Tables.
5. I A, 1894, p 62; I H Q, P 307.
6. K P J, ibid, P 167.
7. The intercalation takes place when two lunar months end within a solar month, which presupposes the existence of a Ksaya month previously, but this is the rule obtained by calculation of true motions.

The above arguments have shown that the epoch of Amshuvarman's era must fall some time in or before 595 A. D. and there can not be two opinions on this subject.

The Tibetan Era of 595 A. D.

Prof. Levi has tried to attribute the epoch of the inscriptions of Amshuvarman to a supposed era of 595 A. D. stated to have originated from Tibet. He put forth two arguments for supposing so, (1) the alleged conquest of Nepal by Strong-Tsang-Gampo and (2) the founding of the era in Tibet in the year 595 A. D[1]. Let us now consider the two of these each separately.

Almost all the authors till now except Dr. Jayaswal have relied on the assertion of the Tibetan chronicle that Nepal was absorbed in the Tibetan Empire at the time of Amshuvarman[2]. The year 629 A. D. was the year of accession to the throne by Strong-Tsang-Gampo. This king was very powerful and at one time seems to have extended his conquest far in the north and south at the cost of China and Nepal. According to Tibtan legend he penetrated into Balpo[3] and Shinkuni[4], two districts of Western Nepal. The Nepalese King offered his daughtar to him in marriage. This marriage proved a boon for the cause of renaissance in Tibet, as the Princess from Nepal took with her a contingent of Buddhist preachers and artists who helped to build a new culture for that country. The name of Sililamanjusri occurs in the list of Nepalese teachers who went to Tibet in that connection. The wife of the Tibetan king was Princess Bhrikuti called Bribtsun and her father's name was Go-cha[5].

The Ladakh chronicles on the other hand do not mention the conquest of Nepal[6] by the Tibetan King before 703 A. D. and this point is confirmed by the T' ang history[7]. Yuan Chwang also has not mentioned

1 Levi, II, P 148-50.

2 JRAS, 1880, P 438; Smith, Early History of India P 438; The Antiquities of ndian Tibet, ii, P 83.

3 Palpa about two hundred miles west.

4 A place in Mustang district, the source of R. Gandak.

5 The Antiquities of Tibet, ibid.

6 IA, VII, PP 89-92; JBAS, Lviii, P150,

7 The T'ang history BKs 256-57; Levi, i, 151-57.

anything about the alleged conquest of Nepal by Tibet in his memoir, wherein Nepal is proudly referred to as an independent country[1]. Levi, however, under a curious conception of the Tibetan history accepts the statement of the Tibetan annal and reads in it a reference to correspond to the Vikramaditya episode of the Nepalese chronicles. Gocha according to him can be only Amshuvarman, whereas the literal translation of the word may mean Jyotivarman or Prabhavarman or Udayavarman as the case may be (JASB, L ix, 54, L, 200). But as it is not possible to rely on the legendary evidence of chronicles in disregard of the authoritative statements of the T'ang and Ladakh histories, Levi's opinion may be discarded and the question of Tibetan suzerainty should not arise, at least, for the time of Amshuvarman as on the authority of the same he was in a position to defeat the Tibetan invader or any other attack from whichever quarter directed. The T'ang history records that before Narendradeva the kingdom of Nepal obeyed no other power on earth.

Prof. Levi has drawn an unwarranted inference from the alleged conquest of Nepal by Tibet that the era of 595, according to him the epoch of the era in Amshuvarman's inscriptions falls in that year, was a Tibetan creation[2]. The year 595 he obtained as a result of a wrong identification between the words San (Persian) and Tsan (Tibetan), by which he was led to assume the origin of the Bengal era in that year and from Tibet, though the assumption is fundamentally wrong as neither the Bengal Era originated in 595 A. D., nor it had any relation with Tibet being as it was set up by Akbar in 1556 A. D. out of a process of transfusion of Hindu eras[3]. The Tibetan conquest of Bengal is another impossibility which is not based on historical facts. The existence of an era in Tibet before 1686 A. D. has been disproved by the findings of scholars whose opinion is uanimous[4]. Till that year the system of reckoning in cycles and periods (loka kala) obtained there as the only rule, the era followed by the

1 Beal, ii, P82; Smith, E. H., pp 365-373.
2 Levi, ii 153-54; iii, 70-81, 82-90; JA, 1894, PP55 ff
3 Prinep's Essays, ii, 167-69; Fleet in Ency Brittanica, xiii.
4 Prinsep, ibid, pp. 160, 289 ; Waddel, Lhasa (1909) p 449.

Tibetans as in the letters to Kirkpatrick (1203 and 1206)[1] referred to the year 586, if it should be regarded as an era at all, although there may be indication against regarding it as such. His attempt to connect the figure 430 in a transposed form of 403 (Me-kha-Jya) is wrong inasmuch as the transposition is unjustified and does not refer to an era counted by years in addition to an entirely different date which it may give rise to. Similarly Prof. Levi's attempt to make out a figure of 595 by deducting 430 out of 1025, the year of another supposed era, seems to rest on sheer imagination[2].

The Epoch of the Era.

It has been found that the dates in Amshuvarman's inscriptions are unaccountable with reference to the eras originated outside Nepal. The epoch, therefore, will have to be sought in the valley itself and in a year in or before 595 A. D. as shown above. There is no doubt, thanks to the researches of Dr. Jayaswal, about the founder of the era who can be no other than that 'Shining splendour', Amshuvarman[3]. His reign is marked with remarkable events, and nothing would be nearer to truth than to state that as one of the great rulers of his time he deserved the position of a founder of the era and all name and fame attached with it[4].

The initial year of his era, likewise, can now be fixed with certainty as the correspondence of the phenomenon of the Sundhara inscription (vide, Bendal, journey, P 74) with that of 629 A. D. is now incontrovertibly established, There is yet one more possibility which has been considered in the light of the above discussion. At the beginning it has been inferred that the year 621 A. D. records an intercalary phenomenon in the month of Pausa according to *Brahma Siddhanta.* But as on Sewell's authority we have to exclude the application of

1 Kirkpatrick: Appendix ii, these letters were sent in appeal to the Governor General of India against Gorkha encroachment in 1789 A. D.

2 JBORS, III, 1936, pp 174-75.

3 Ibid.

4 The assertion of the Vamsabali that Vikramaditya came to Nepal and founded the era is only one of the fantastic and inconceivably wrong inferences by which Gautama Buddha and other personalities of the plains were directly connected with the history of the country.

this astronomical method from times before 629 A. D., the question of an adjustment for that period does not come at all, and, therefore, we can say without doubt that the epoch of the era falls only in 595 A. D. (629-34) and not eight years before[1].

The year 595 A. D.

It has been often said that the epoch of the era is connected with the year of the first appointment of Amshuvarman as the Mahasamanta. The absence of inscriptions, however,for such a long interval militates against attempts at pushing such conclusion further. If he was crowned as a regent in 624 A. D., there is no reason whatsoever that he should choose the year of his Vassalage which was an insignificant post, to commemorate his glorious regime. It is much probable that he dates his inscriptions from the year of his birth[2]. We must not attach too much importance to the assertion of the chronology that Amshuvarman ruled for forty three years. His accession to higher position before 620 A. D. must be taken not without disbelief, for the Manjusri history[3] and the *Vamsabalis*[4] both speak of Gupta sovereignty in the valley before that date. Amshuvarman's rise probably occurred simultaneouslywith Lichhavi restoration and it does not seem that he could have otherwise reached that position under Gupta supremacy.

The following inscriptions and records belong to Amshuvarman:—

(a) Harigaon[5] Grant. This is the earliest inscription for Amshuvarman's reign. It was discovered in Harigaon, a few miles east of the present Bhatgaon. It consists of twentyfour lines incised on an iron plate at the wall of a temple in Harigaon. The language is sanskrit and the content is in prose. The inscription begins with *Svasti Kailaskuta bhavanat*[6] as all

1 Other dates corresponding to this phenomenon lie outside the probable date of Amshuvarman as testified by Yuan Chwang.

2 Almost all the inscription assign him a reign period of 42 or 43 years (Kirkpatrick, P262 ; IA, XIII, 413; Wright P133).

3 MMK, pp. 40.

4 Kirkpatrick, P. 262.

5 Levi, III, pp 85-88.

6 Madhya Lakhu of the chronicle. The remains of this palace are to be seen in the high mound of earth now resembling almost a hill of the same name near Pashupati temple. Levi, ii, P138.

other inscriptions of his which denotes a change of the seat of government from Managriha, the place from which the inscriptions of the previuos rulers are issued. Amshuvarman uses there the usual title of Mahasamanta following the inscriptions of Shivadeva I (vide later) with the epithet भगवत पशुपति भट्टारक बप्पपादानुध्यात (Bhagvat Pashupati bhattaraka bappa padanudhyata) which is common in all his inscriptions.

He has described himself as one always looking to other's interests. It has noted a list of donations to varous deities and state officers requiring them to receive the same from their people. It is dated Samvat 30=624 A. D.

Pu—Purana, Pa—Pana, both silver coins[1].

Sridevi pu 3 pa 1

Sasthidevakula pu 3 pa 1

Sribhattarakapadanam pu pa (worshippers of Pashupati)

Mahabaladhyakhya pu 20 (Grand Commander-in-Chief)

Prasad Krita pu 25 (Head of the Department of Donations)

Abhisekahasti Kaswa pu 3 pa 1 (the department of elephants and horses for annointation).

There are other donees like the four door keepers of his palace and those of Managriha.

(6) II Haragaon plate inscriptions. The epigraph contains an address issued to the peasants and families of the said village asking them to contribute certain donations to the religious organisation (Mariyada Bandha Kirtan)[2]. Amshuvarman is spoken of as the person ever devoted to the welfare of his subjects (Prajahitartha dyata Suddhachetasa; Katham praja me Sukhita bhaveyu)[3]. The record dates samvat 32=626 A. D. The organisations belong to various sects and forms of worship.

1 K. P. Jayaswal opines that these Silver coins were meant only to facilitate calculation into Karsapanas.

2 Levi, III, 92-96; Basak, P 254.

3 Lines 21 and 22.

Shaivism : Pashupati 7, 2; Rameswara 3, 1 ; Maneswara 3, 1; Dhara maneswara 3, 1 ; Parvateswara, 3, 1 ; Kailaseswara 3, 1 ; Bhattaraka Padah 7, 2. Vaisnavism : Dolasikharanarayan 7, 2 ; Samba pura 3, 1 ; Bhumbhujika Jalasayara (Budha nilkantha) 3, 1.; Buddhism: Gurmvihara 7, 2 (Mani Chuda Chaitya); Manavihara (Chakravihara in Patan) 7, 2 ; Ravivihara 7, 2; Kharjurikavihara 7, 2; Madhyama Vihara 3, 1 and Samanya Vihara 3, 1. This inscription indicates that up till his time the tantric Mahayana and Vajrayan deities had not made appearance in Nepal, and the various constituent units of the committees of management al.o are noted to have been provided for (lines 16-19).

(c) Sanga inscription discovered in 1902[1]. The date is Samvat 34. This is in the form of an address to the heads of the village conceding to them the privilege of certain remissions in the matters of taxation on account of their contribution of oil to the Government. The Dutaka is Rajaputra Vikramasena, probably brother or son of Rajaputra Surasena (of IA, No. 7). He also figures in the Bungmati inscription (IA, ix, p 169) of Amshuvarman dated Samvat 34[2]. He has his own inscription dated Samvat 335 (IA, IX, P168).

(d) The same stone-slab of Bungmati. This is an order of the Mahasamanta to his officers for the preservation of animals and foods.

(e) The inscription of the year 34, which has been already dealt with (vide ante). The dutaka is Vinduswami.

(f) The Pashupati inscription incised on a stone slab (IA, IX, p 170); In this inscription Amshuvarman leaves the title Mahasamanta and merely adds to himself as *Sri*. It appears that he now became the President of the Republic. We have here his sister and nephew as donators of certain grants to the Shaiva gods. The dutaka is prince Udayadeva. He is according to Fleet and Indraji a Lichhavi personage,[3]

1 Levi, III, P 99-101.
2 Basak, ibid, P 255.
3 Fleet, IA, XIV, P 344.

but Jayaswal makes him a Thakuri[1]. The record dates in Samvat 39=634 A. D. There is a reference to his nephew, Bhogavarma, who is wrongly identified with the Maukhari King of the same name, though the times of the two in no way agree.

(g) *Yuan Chwang's statement:* It has been unanimously held that the Chinese pilgrim visited Vaishali, if not Nepal, in 637 A. D. He wrote about Nepal "The kingdom of Nepala (Nipolo) is 4000 li north. It is situated over a mountain The Capital is about 20 li in circuit. The country is full of mountains and valleys. It is favourable for the production of grains and abounds in flowers and fruits, also copper, yaks and birds of the name of *ming-ming* (jivamjiva). In commerce copper coin is used[2]. The climate is cold, the people are rude and deceitful and naturally unsociable. They do not know the value of time and justice and have no learning but they are much skilled in arts. Their body is awkward and their appearance is ignoble. There are amongst them both heretics and followers of true religion. The Buddhist monasteries and temples touch each other. There are two thousand monks living in monasteries, belonging to both vehicles (Hinayana and Mahayana). The number of Brahmanas cannot be said exactly. The king is of the caste of Kshatriya (T'sa-ti-li) and belongs to the race of (Lichhavi) (Li-tchi-po). He is of pure feeling and eminent of science. He is a loyal Buddhist. In the time just passed (*Dansices derniers temps*) there was a king called Amshuvarman (Yan-chou-fa-mo) who was distinguished by the soundness of his knowledge and sagacity of his spirit. He himself composed a treatise on connaissance of sounds (shadba vidya shastra). He esteemed knowledge and respected virtue; his reputation had travelled in all places."

1 JBORS, ibid, P. 229.

2 Levi, I, P. 154-55 ; Beal, ii, p 81 ; Watters, ii, p 84. The last two slightly differ from Julien.

"To the south-east of the capital there is one small spring on the surface of which a brilliant flame rises if one throws fire there. If one throws other objects, they change their nature and become fire". (Memoirs surles countries, etc.=vide Ante, Julien).

Parallel to Yuan Chwang's observation rises a question, and let us have dealt with it here, as to when Amshuvarman died, whether in 637 or 639 A. D.; for the pilgrim has mentioned him in terms of a deceased and in past tense. The most important point in this connection is whether his description of Nepal is true of the year of his visit or of the time he left India or of the time when he reached China. Jayaswal holds that this observation is true of the year 643, when he had just left India[1]. It is clear that Amshuvarman's successor was a Lichhavi, either Manadeva or Dhruvadeva. We have references about them in Jisnu Gupta's inscriptions (IA, IX, p 171 ff. Levi, III, P104), but nothing can be said about Amsuvarman's death year, as only one inscription of Jisnu Gupta has preserved the line mentioning that date and this is certainly the last date, for we cannot push the year of Narendradeva's restoration beyond 644 A. D., which is also the corresponding date for *Samvat 48*, (*China mastika temple, Patan*) in view of the information supplied by the T'ang history on this question[2]. Jayaswal bases his conclusion on the existence of two sets of inscriptions, all about Amshuvarman himself, the one dating Samvat 44 or 45 (IA, IX, 171)[3] and the other constituting the group issued in the name of Shivadeva I, of which the two have ascertained date figures of 316[4] (or 318?) and 320. The former (the Satdhara inscription) record the building of a conduit by varta Vibhuvarman *under favour*[5] of Sri Amshuvarman. Shivadeva's inscriptions are all issued from Managriha with the usual title of *Bhattaraka Maharaja Lichhavi Kulaketu* and describe in high terms the achievements of his High Feudatory[6]. The last inscription of his is dated 320 (khopasi)[7] and according to Jayaswal who follows Fleet in

1 JBORS, ibid, P 162.
2 JBORS, OP. Cit.
3 Fleet, IA, XIV, P 343.
4 Fleet reads 318, ibid; Bendal 316; KPJ 316; Basak 318.
5 Vijaya rajye.
7 Levi, III, p 79.
6 Shivadeva's inscription, Ins. No. 5 of IA, P 174.

this respect, this year should be referred to the Gupta era so that Shivadeva's last date is made to correspond to 319+320=639 A. D. (March), the same year which was also the last reignal year of Amshuvarman according to the Satdhara inscription and the Thankot inscription[1] of Jisnu Gupta of the same year (KpJ. OP, Cit. P169). This coincidence of the end of both Amshuvarman and Shivadeva I, of course, may have a meaning generally attached to accidental happenings; but it is difficult to accept the proposition that Amshuvarman was a sovereign over the whole kingdom in 639 A. D. when in that very year Amshuvarman is *on his own advice* treated as the High Feudatory by Shivadeva I. The coins of Amshuvarman leave no doubt as to his supreme power and foremost position in Nepal of that time[2]. His inscriptions have also indicated that he had dropped the title of High Feudatory from 634 A. D. There is no justification to continue to hold him as such till 639 A. D. unless we mean that his position even according to the last was no longer of a full sovereign as inferred by Fleet (IA, XIV, P412 ff). But the latter part of the argument has no solid ground to stand on, for in no case we learn of a political division in the valley at that time[3]. We can not, therefore, establish that Amshuvarman was dead only in 639 or 40 on the mere convenient identity displayed by Shivadeva's inscriptions with the Gupta era. On the other hand as asserted by Cunningham (Op. cit. p 646) and confirmed by Dr. Tripathi's researches (vide, ante) Amshuvarman seems to have died early in 637 A. D. and this is quite logical and natural in view of the fact that the pilgrim would in no circumstances have postponed his taking note till 643[4] A D. Moreover, he speaks of Amshuvarman to have been dead *in the time just passed*, which if referred to 643 A. D. may also mean that he died only in 642 A. D. much against other evidences. So far as Sivadeva's inscriptions are concerned, they can be referred to the period while Amshuvarman was a High Feudatory and not to the period

1 Ibid. P 107. Levi reads 500. Basak reads 300.

2 Walsh, JRAS, P 680-81.

3 Fleet in GI discusses at great length the possibility of the valley to have been ruled in two parts under the Lichhavis and the Thakuris respectively. This, however, is negatived by another evidence revealed by the existence of Amsu's records both in the west and the east as far as Sanga at the east of the valley.

4 Jayaswal also admits that he took down notes in 637 A. D. It is surprising as to how Jayaswal pushed the death year of Amshu to 639 A. D.

while he became the head of the State. The inscription depicts a stage wherein Amshuvarman had certainly gathered immense power[1] as a High Feudatory and as such may be placed near about the year Samvat 32 (=628 A. D) but not after that and this will certainly confirm the finding that the Gupta epoch of his inscriptions must be declared as for good dismissed.

The existence of an epoch in 319 A. D. has led people to assume that the dates in Shivadeva I's inscriptions must be referred to that year only[2]. While not taking such assumption as entirely impossible, we must realise that there is no paucity of eras in India or anywhere within India and, therefore, it is not indispensably necessary to cling to one era, specially, under circumstances when the divergence amounts to twenty years or more. In our case there is one more reason to drop the epoch of 319 A. D. even on the former ground, for we have in Bhaskara Varman of the Lichhavi dynasty, a great conqueror who was at one time the overlord of the whole of north and north eastern Gangetic basin, the type of a person and in his time we may find out a suitable period for the era of Shivadeva's inscriptions[3]. Shivadeva I who calls himself a *Lichhavi Kulaketu* i.e. the banner of the family, should not have allowed any other era when dealing with a base year of his reckoning. The Gupta era accordingly does not hold ground and the death of Amshuvarman should now be put in the year 637 A. D. or near about thatyear.

As regards the Thankot inscription the objections are very many, the most important being the reading of the date which has not yet gone correct and may offer people differnt dates ranging from 40 to 44. There is also the statement of this inscription which by recording the grant as having accrued from Sri Amshuvarman has made the acceptance of his existence at the time of issue somewhat doubtful. Even when we interpret it as to have vouchsafed his existence, no conclusion can be formed till the figure is read correctly. Consequently the inscription should be left out of account for the matter of date.

1 He is spoken of as a great, virtuous and powerful person.

2 K. P. Jayaswal, Op. cit.

3 Wright, P 113.

The Thakuris.

The term Thakuri is by present usage applied to the Ksatriya settlers of the Himalayas, whose origin is commonly believed to have been somewhere in Rajputana as distinct from the class of the Khasa Ksatriyas who by popular understanding are definitely debarred from using this term for reasons of inferior origin. Thakuri is a common word in Rajputana as well and this is generally applicable to denote a status of the class in question as meant in Nepal, but the form is slightly different as there, Thakur, which is a term used for Brahamans in Bihar and Bengal, is generally used. The identity of the two forms, however, definitely signifies their common origin and affinity of meaning and also the fact of the word having been used in Nepal is an importation with closely terminological identity, so that the two could appear as almost the same expression with identical signification.

The Nepalese *Vansabalis* have used the term in the same sense to denote the fact of Amshuvarman's original stock to have emigrated from somewhere in the plains. We have no authority to confirm this position save the most probable inference that Amshuvarman was not an exception to the traditional and almost universal application of outside nationality to the rulers in Nepal, who without a single exception, have shown a community of origin in this respect. But the particular clan or dynasty he belonged to is still a matter of undecisive speculation as his inscriptions have no word to shed light on this point. In the Brahmanical chronicles he is a Vaisya Rajput, probably meaning indirectly that he was of the dynasty of Harsabardhana. But then the question comes as to why he did not use the common family appendage *bardhana* after his name. He may be a Maukhari as his appendage and the rise of his ancestors in Nepal coincident of the rise of the Maukharis in the plains show.

Amshuvarman's status.

His status before 634 A. D. has been already commented upon. It is said that these inscriptions variously depict the stages through which Amshuvarman passed to reach the ultimate position to have called himself "Sri Amshuvarma". We have just hinted that he was merely a High Feudatory in Samvat 318. After two years his status rises in importance

and the King addresses him in a more dignified term, if Sri were to express higher status. a Those who regard him as the sovereign of the west take the title Mahasamanta as equal to the King. In support of this the example of Samudra Sena and Pushya Sena is cited. The co-ordinate nature of the titles is shown in the Nirmund plate of the former (JBAS, XLVIII, Proceedings, P 247 ff) and in the Waladay seal of the latter (ibid, xii, 212, Dr. Buhler's restoration)[1]. But such examples may also confuse the true status of Amsuvarman, as similar titles deemed to be equal with kingship have been assumed by less important personages [Levi, vi (Kisipidi) ; Bendal No. VII] in the Nepal history. According to the inscription of Pushyamitra Sunga who calls himself Mahapratihara and Sarvadandanayaka, it appears that the title Maharaja falls in line with these[2]. In Nepal, however, such comparison would belie the real position of the ruler for on a proper stuly, 'Amshuvarman's supposed kingship cannot be ascertained to bear out the fact, apart from the confusion resulting from the identity between his and Ravigupta's titles (Ins. No. 3, IA, IX). We have seen that in the year Samvat 320 Shivadeva I was Maharaja of Nepal and a sovereign. In this year he calls Amshuvarman as Mahasamanta and though the reference is certainly respectful, it however, fails to show a sovereign status of Amshuvarman. His continuation of the title as late as 633 A. D. also proves that he till then recognised the overlordship of the Lichhavi king, however nominal it may appear to be. The fact that he had been using Sri from Samvat 30 (= 625 A.D.) would not make him completely independent[3]. Shivadeva's ascetic life and his indifference to worldly affairs was one of the main reasons which secured for Amshuvarman an unchallenged position in the realm. But it was not such as to overthrow the dynasty altogether, which is also supported by the existence of another sovereign of that line occurring in the inscriptions of Jisnugupta[4], and confirmed by Yuan Chawan's observation[5]. Amshuvarman continued to use this title up to Samvat 39, when

1 Fleet, IA, XIV, 345. Pushyamitra Sunga calls himself Senapati even after he became King (JBORS, XVIII, p 311).

2 Malavikagnimitra, Act V, P131 (S. P. Pandit's Ed.) Ayodha inscription, JBORS 1924, pp. 202-0.8). Rudradaman called himself Maha Ksatrapa (EI, VIII, p 40-45).

3 IA, IX, pp. 168, 169; Bendal, p. 74; Levi, iii, pp 65, 90, 97.

4 IA, IX, pp 71 ff; Levi, iii. pp ,105 ff.

5 O P. Cit.

he dropped the title of *High Feudatory* and retained only Sri before his name. This is taken by some as the indication of his sovereignty from that year. While not rejecting the possibility of his adopting the supreme position in the State at a later date, we have, however, no reason to believe that Amshuvarman adopted the title of kingship. Had it been otherwise he should not have hesitated to use the more obvious term of connotation than Sri by adopting the title of Bhattaraka Maharaja. The possibility of his being another type of head, probably in the nature of a President of a republic, seems to be nearer to fact, while at the same time his power was unchallenged and unequalled with any autocratic king and there was no lessening of status an inch even, as his assumption of the authority and royalty by which he could issue command to other Fudatories and injunctions to future kings (स्वयमाज्ञा) would convey. His assumption of the title, Sri, without Mahasamanta from that year shows that before this time he was only a Regent but with fullest equipment of executive powers and all the affairs of the State were subject to his orders (प्रज्ञा पितेन·) In Samvat 390 (= 634 A. D.)[1] however, he ceased to be a Regent and became the formal head of the State. There are coins of his name, which have only Sri affixed and prove thereby that the real status assumed by Amshuvarman was certainly of a nature bordering on Presidentship of a State[2]. We realise that the mere fact of coinage is unable to expound the statue of kingship, as we have in Nepal coins in the name of the Regents as well. We have, therefore, to agree with Dr. Indraji and Dr. Fleet that Jisnugupta's reference to him as sovereign (Maharajadhiraja) has the only significance of a posthumous title and conferred so as to base one's own claim to suzerainty on his reignal powers (IA,IX, P 171) or mere courtesy reference to a sovereign authority.

A point which so far had escaped the attention of scholars is that Amshuvarman never enjoined on the future kings to maintain his works as those issued from a king himself, which was a conventional expression (*Purvarja krita prasadanuvartibhi*)[3] even used by Jisnugupta. But

1 IA, ix, p 170.

2 Walsh, JRAS, 1908, p 681; Smith, Catalogue of coins in Indian Museum, 1906 i 281-83; Cunningham, coins of Ancient India, p 112, Plate XIII. His coins have the image of a cow (Kamadohi).

3 IA, ix, p 169.

Amshuvarman always isssued them in the name of a respectful person (*Guru krita prasadanuvartibhi*)[1]. At one place he has used the old expression but qualifies it with (*dharma gurutaya*) wherein the emphasis is laid, though the future kings are styled as those who fulfil the wishes of royal predecessors. By the new expression he certainly showed himself to have issued them under religious sanctity[2].

Amshuvarman's achievements.

From Yuan Chwang[3] we learn that he had attained a high military and literary glory. This is no mean compliment to his attainments, for the Chinese pilgrim was as much scrupulous in bestowing praises as he admired very few. Amshuvarman, however, was a man of uncommon talents and Yuan Chawang, with all his scruples would not have left him out of his account.

His military feats commenced earlier when he carried his army to the east and south against the unruly feudal lords. Like its parallel organisation in India, feudalism in Nepal meant the rule of barons, called the Samantas. They were military Governors in another way and were also responsible for the conduct of administrative affairs in their respective areas. These Samantas owed loyalty and allegiance to the king but at times when opportunity presented itself to shake off that loyalty, they did not feel any hesitation to seize it by the forelock. The Ahir Gupta domination of the valley had come in that way and so followed Amshuvarman's dictatorship at this stage. But Amshuvarman's time was a time of unusual crisis. His predecessor Shivadeva I, the Lichhavi sovereign, was a weakling and naturally failed for sheer lack of kingly qualities to rise to the occasion. On the other hand the century old Guptan regime was as strong as ever. Besides, there were autonomous principalities in the east and west, over one of which Amshuvarman was a ruler. The whole of eastern Nepal on the authoriry of the *MMK* was ruled by the Mlechhas[4]. The Terai was ruled by a king of the

2 His coins have on the obverse a winged lion with one raised hand and on the reverse his name. One of his coins also bears the title 'Maharajadhiraja'. A third has the divine cow (Kamadhenu).

1 See all his inscriptions in IA, ix, pp 168-171 ; Levi, iii, pp 81-97.

3 Vide Ante.

4 MMK, P42.

Gupta dynasty from Simraongarh[1]. The only portion of the country which still acknowledged the overlordship of the Lichhavis was the land of the Thakuris and here probably the former had found shelter in their worst days in the care of Amshuvarman.

The common people nurtured a hidden grievance against the Gupta usurpers and there was a longing in their heart of hearts to welcome the old Lichhavi dynasty whose position in the realm was regarded as the only legal royalty by the populace. This rendered the Lichhavi restoration a matter of public concern and Amshuvarman at the head of the army had only responded to this long felt want of the people in waging a war with the Guptas to drive them out.

The course of battles waged by him is unknown, as we have no account local or foreign on this particular subject. His inscriptions do not help us at all in this direction. Whatever slight description is there about his achievements we have in very vague and general terms. Yet the following will give some knowledge of the country and people of Nepal in the time of Amshuvarman.

According to one inscription of Sivadeva I, dated 318 (Bendal, I. A., XIV, P97-98; Journey 74), Amshuvarman rose to heights of glory by his acts of victories over the enemies. As to over whom these victories were won the inscription is silent. It merely puts that Amshu had a great influence by his immense powers and thereby crushed his enemies (L. 6 *Bipula parakrama prasamita*). But it may be admitted as a testament to prove the restoration of the Lichhavis in that year and perhaps also stands for the first record of Amshu's military exhibits His activities have been further noted in the next inscription, though with the same vagueness of description. In this inscription (No. 5 of Indraji) he is the complete master of the situation (*Hata sakala shatru paksa prabhava aneka ..Vijayadhigata*) and this shows that the war of his conquest did not last long, which is further confirmed by the next inscription (Levi, ix) with a short statement about his valour shown in quelling the enemies. By that time he had also earned a reputation for his administrative sagacity.

1 Kirkpatrick, P262.

The above, however, is not in itself sufficient to support his conquest of the Gupta Ahirs unless these inscriptions were to be considered as partly complementary to the accounts of the chronicles which, in spite of the erroneous nature of the whole, have shown approach to truth on certain segregated points of individual estimation and this part of the genealogical history taken along with the anecdotes of the inscriptions and the story of Amshu's reputation in India may be taken as approximately correct.

Extent of the Kingdom.

Some people have lent unusual stress to the minimised estimate of the extent of Nepal's boundary in those days, by which they maintain that it covered then only the valley of Nepal with some areas in the east. Nothing would, however, be so erroneous as to readily accept such views without examining the evidence supplied to us by geneological anecdotes. Even excluding the Kiratas who held sway over a large part of the country, almost all the ruling dynastics of the valley have controlled the other portions as well so that Nepal always had come to be known for that stretch of Himalayan territories which lie between the river Gandak and the river Dudh Kosi, probably in keeping with what three hundred years later *Nepal Mahatmya* calls the same *Nepala Khanda*[1]. The boundary line must have been subject to changes in relation to the political structure of the countries in the vicinity, but the two rivers were acknowledged as the natural frontier lines of the Kingdom. Amshuvarman had added a greater portion of the Terai to the dominion and it what the *Vamsabalis* write with reference to the Guptas is correct, their defeat must have led to the absorption of all territories touching the Vrizzis and probably the line travelled along the River Gandak up to the point where it leaves the hills, so that Amshu can be safely given the sovereignty of the present Bettiah district as well to make his frontier conterminious with that of Sri Harsa. To keep Harsavardhana at arms length close in the plains was not an uncommon task, which only speaks of him as the true hero of extraordinary strength, a corollary estimate which follows from a consideration of the extent of his vast empire. Equally his stand

1 Nepal Mahatmya (Prabhakari Company), Banaras, P 6.

against the Tibetan menace is praiseworthy and as it follows from the Chinese annals Amshuvarman's independent position must surely reflect a veritable credit on him for his glorious and statesmanlike action to have kept aloft the banner of Nepal so high in the critical circumstances. Of course, no particular connection with Tibet can be established for lack of any authoritative sources of information of the time, but the admission of the T'ang history and Yuan Chwang must dispel all doubts about his acceptance of Tibetan suzerainty or about a case of surrender voluntary or otherwise by Amshuvarman out of a sense of apprehension. If at all some weight be attached to the Tibetan chronicles, the Tibeto-Nepalese war alone may appear a reality, but without any adverse consequences falling upon the combatants the incident seems to have been closed. At any case this was certain that Amshuvarman's position was unchallenged from any quarter.

Amhsuvarman was not merely a military adventurer. He was also a man of high literary talents. He seems to have composed a book on Etymology, the work which is now lost but which has been referred to in high terms of appreciation by the Chinese pilgrim. Amshuvarman had a concourse of scholars around him including that great grammarian Chandra Varman who had made a name in the Nalanda University as a talented scholar. In conjunction with him Amsuvarman helped a great deal to give effect to the use of correct Sanskrit language in all written works which so long were subject to the odd type of defective language current in the locality. In his time the language used in inscriptions appeared purified and recorded a seemingly improved style over the one contributed previously. His literary pursuit was carried with the best of feeling and courage and though himself a public figure Amshu never allowed the least lack of zeal or interest to affect it. And all India and China looked at his tenacity of purpose and wide outlook with the most profuse appreciation. No wonder that under such a man Nepal banished the evils of illiteracy from its border.

Administrative capacity.

This has been mentioned already in previous connections. Amshuvarman was imbued with the highest sentiment and sense of public dignity and honour, in which no body excelled him. He was unique of

all the dictators or Regents of the age as a true servant of the people having always before him the only one desire and that was how to serve the best interest of the people (कथं प्रजामे सुखिता भवेयुः प्रजाहित समाधान तत्पर(*Prajapita samadhana tatpara*)[1] That he was so without doubt can be inferred from the compliments of Yuan Chwang independent of all inscriptional or chronological considerations. The Chinese pilgrim whose strict sense of duty as a hermit made him immune from all political bias, must be relied on to have told nothing but the truth in this respect and his pen has depicted an authentic account of Amshu's personality. He has singled the King of Nepal not only out of the coteries of his hill contemporaries or out of the long list of names belonging to the plains to whose individuality a reference could have been made, but out of the whole series of trans-Himalayan Kings, a fact which testifies to the high place the potentate enjoyed amongst the fellow royals of those days. It was not merely a military glory, as we know, that endowed Amshuvarman with such high reputation. Foremost of all he was an administrator of great talents and of high moral strength and of broad mentality and magnanimous spirit built up to perfection of all the high ideals of public service and shorn of the blemishes of narrow religious zeal and bigotry. To him no orthodoxy appealed and to him no vain glory or pride could approach, and to him no self-interest could touch, says the Chinese pilgrim.

Religious Policy.

In spite of the fact that he was a Shaivite Hindu, Amshuvarman was also all attentive to the requirement and need of other forms of worship including Buddhism. Under him no religion was persecuted. On the other hand his consideration was bestowed on all forms of religious worship irrespective of his own attachment. From one of his inscriptions we learn that his contribution to Buddhist monasteries were equally magnificent and followed the only rule of responding to need of each for royal beneficence.His adoption of the title of PASUPATI BHATTARAKA PADANUDHYTA may lead some to interpret it as a sign of his allegiance to Shaivite cult. That certainly he was and this is further confirmed by the image of a cow in some of his inscriptions(IA, IX, pp 169, 170, 171)

1 Sanga Inscription, Levi, iii, PP 97-98.

But in them there is no trace of partiality or prejudice in favour of one to the exclusion of the others. How he revered the Buddhist religion is expressed by his adoption of the symbols of the wheel of law between two deer (Bungmati Inscription)[1] in his inscription, which is certainly expressive of his intention to protect all religions from unlawful encroachments and harassment by the one enjoying undue royal munificence. It was really a big attempt to improve the much deteriorated condition of the last reign, which seems to have been characterised by communal quarrels and disturbances. The Gupta rulers being of orthodox Shaivite faith would not perhaps tolerate the freedom enjoyed by the other sects and persecution was rife on that account, and which was so much resented by the people that it necessitated the change of ruling dynasties. Amshuvarman with his keen insight of human behaviour and laudable conception of public duty reoriented the policy pursued by the Lichhavi Kings, himself helped to restore the Lichhavi throne and willingly and sincerely put his own faith in the order of the Buddha as a measure of harmonious understanding between the rulers and the ruled, and under him the sanctity of Buddhist images and monasteries was well preserved and honourably maintained[2].

The repercussion of this non-committal and tolerant policy was far reaching. An atmosphere of good will and trust amongst the different sections of people and of veneration to all types of religious beliefs irrespective of caste and creed enveloped the land of the Nepalese to an extent that the whole envelopment is still engrossing the social life of the people in this country, the same which was so markedly noted by the Chinese pilgrim when he spoke of the Hindu temples touching the Buddhist convents, the same structure of harmony and complete fraternal adjustment which are indelibly passed on to the present generation unaffected by no sort of political bickerings and incitement or communal animosity. The message of toleration, the gift of Amshuvarman's reign, rings sweet in the ears of every Nepalese even today and blends him with all his fellowmen in the perfect bond of brotherhood and amity the world has ever seen. Amshuvarman has certainly raised his fame to the

1 I A, IX, P 169.

2 The many Shaivite Sects were (1) Varahaswamidharma, somakhadduka, mundasringa (No 11, IA, Ix, p 174) There was no official interference.

zenith as a man of the people to have dissociated himself and politics from religious prejudices and to have looked upon all with no partiality or reserved feeling in which policy Ashoka alone can be his equal.

Incidentally we may refer to the nature of interference on religious endowments, which was used only to the extent of ensuring the obedience to the Government's order, but it was mainly on the personal initiative of the ruler that any step in that direction was taken, the convention being that the Sovereign had alone the privilege of investigation or supervision in such matters. All endowments were managed on behalf of the people by a committee called panchalika whose immunity from all official interference was equally guaranteed. All religious orders had their own organisations as noted in inscriptions. There was one such country-wide organisation of the Buddhist monks, known as *Bhiksu Sangha,* which co-ordinated the activities of the monasteries and was very powerful and sometimes in a position to issue its own decrees and edicts to the constituent members[1] (Sankhu Inscription, Levi, 111, p 112).

Economic policy.

Amshuvarman's economic policy was actuated by only one consideration and that was how to benefit the people of the country. It was, therefore, natural that he should always devote himself to the improvement of trade and commerce of the country. His time on that account was the most prosperous, for we have on the evidence of the T'ang annal that the country was fully advanced and developed in commere when Wang Hieuntse visited Nepal. Amshuvarman, at first, put the monetary system in order by introducing new copper and silver coins and by adjusting the deficiency of the former debased coins of gold[2]. On the medium of exchange depended the whole basis of commercial transaction and by effecting the monetary reforms he fulfilled a great need of the trading community. The country enjoyed the monopoly of the trade passing between Nepal and Tibet and also of the transit trade between Tibet and India. The Government was alive to the need for maintain-

1 The text of the inscription is 'Deyadharmo Yam 'Sridharmarajikamatyasu... .....Samghikabhiksu Sanghasya.'

2 Walsh, Op cit, P 678; KPJ, Op. cit, P 215.

ing this entrepot trade, and ensured supply of transit labour to all concerned. If under him the commercial position would not have been strengthened, never was such a hope to be entertained. His was the most prosperous time from that point of view.

It was not to be supposed that the industrial advance was effected at the cost of agricultural economy. Agriculture was a secondary occupation in the valley but that was no reason for the state to neglect its development. Amshuvarman and his successors understood the significance of agricultural prosperity and they, therefore, ran a network of canals for the purpose (तिलमाकम्) which in the end produced untold advantage for the peasants. The hilly nature of the country naturally offered the only prospect of terrace irrigation.

In matter of irrigation the Government exhibited the utmost sense of prudence and constructive ability. It was not such as to have merely erected a water course and then left it to run, as was the case with the lax administration of those days. But under the sagacious regime of Amshuvarman and his successors, everything was well conducted in the best interest of stability and efficiency, which naturally resulted in checking wastage and in preventing undersupply as the case may be. The writ issued to the villagers whose committee managed the administration of such water works directed them under state provisions to use water in proportion to specified allotments, to use for themselves or to divide it with others according as it was stipulated (Ins. 14, IA, IX. सप्रधाविभज्य भोक्तव्यं). To meet the capital expenditure and upkeep of the canals, the Government levied water tax on all users, which shows also the source of finance by which all such affairs were managed by the state.

Taxes.

Three forms of direct taxes have been noted from the inscriptions, (1) the tax on the Mallas (Levi, 111,109,) (2) water tax and (3) the contribution made for the maintenance of religious endowments (समुचित देहभाग भागकर हिरण्यादि)[1]. Two forms of local taxation touching only a

1 Ins. No, 12, IA, IX, P 172.

few localities are also known in regard to Tibet, which were transport service[1] and oil contribution[2].

The Account of the T'ang History.

We now come to the account of the T'ang history, which applies to the year 646 A. D. We have to observe here that though the estimate was prepared for that year, conditions prevailing then obtained throughout the seventh and eighth centuries, so that they may be taken as representative of the period in review here. We have also to remark that the policy outlined in relation to Amshuvarman's regime was common with the successive regimes and therefore we may take them too as representative of that period.

Here is the extract from the T'ang annals :—

1 "The Si-Kouo-hing-tchonan of wang Hiuen-tse says : In the second year of-Hien-King (657) wang Hiuen-tse and certain others were sent by imperial order to the kingdoms of the west for offering Buddha a Kasaya. They went to Nepala towards the South-west. Aftter arriving in Pouo-to-tou, they reached the east of the village where there was a depressed bed. There was a small pond with water in fire. If one takes in hand some lighted fire to illuminate it, suddenly on its surface appears a luminous fire which emerges from the very bosom of the water. If one wishes to extinguish it by drenching it with the water, the water changes into fire and burns. The Chinese envoy and his followers placed there on a cooking vessel and thus prepared their nourishment by heating. The envoy interrogated the king of the country, the king replied to him. "Yore, in striking strokes with a staff, one made to appear a chest of gold ; order was given to a man to drag it out. But each time that one pulled it out, it replunged. Tradition says that it is the gold of the diadem of Mi-le P'ou Sa (Maitreya Bodhisattva), Who is due to come to complete the path. The Naga of five protects it and defends it ; the fire of this lake is the fire of the Naga of fire"[3].

1 भोट्ट विशिष्ट हेतोः भारिक जना पञ्च व्यवसायिभिः ग्रहितन्या ।

2 युष्मद्रू पिदाय तोदार्थमू अध्यामेण प्रतिमुत्का नदेवम वस्तुतैलम् देयम्

3 Mission of Wang-Fragment IV, drawn from Fa-Youen-tchon-lir Chap. xvi, P 154, Col. 7. Tao - che, xxxvi, 1, P, 5a. Levi ii, P. 157-59 ; JBORS, 1936, iii P 241-43. (Translation by A. P. Banerji Shastri).

11 "To the South-East of tha capital, at a small distance, there is a lake of water and of fire. In going one li towards the east, one finds the fountain A-ki-po-li (the Youen-tcho-lin bears : Aki-po-mi ; the same alternations in the two redactions of the history of the T'ang). Its circumference is of 20 pou (40 pales). In the dry time as the season of the rains, it is deep ; it does not dissipate but keeps on steaming always. If one holds in hand some lighted fire the entire tank takes fire: the smokes and the fire rise several feet high. If one drenches this fire with some water, then the fire becomes more intense. If one launches therein powdered dust, the flame ceases and what one throws therein turns to ash. If one places a cooking vessel over the water to prepare the food by heating, it is well heated. There was in olden time in this fountain a coffer of gold. A king ordered to drag this coffer out. When one had brought it out of the mud, the men and elephants pulled at it without succeeding in making it come out. And in the night a supernatural voice says : Here is the diadem of Maitreya Buddha ; creatures could not assuredly obtain it, because the Naga of Fire guards it." [The reference is probably to *Akhri pokhri* in the vicinity of the Godavari village, south-east of Deb Patan but not to Tou-dah (south-west) as proposed by Levi (i, 159).]

"To the south of the town, at more than 10 li is found an isolated mountain covered with an extraordinary vegetation, temples are disposed there in numerous stores which one would take for a crown of clouds under the pines and the bamboos. The fishes and the dragons followman, time and confiding. They approach the man and come to receive what to eat. Who does them violence causes the ruin of those and his own".

"Recently the orders of the Empire passed by the Kingdom and thence extended far. Now it depends on T'en fan (Tibet)" (Fragments II and III)

"In the capital of Nepal there is a construction in storeys which has more than 200 tch'en of height and 80 peu (400 ft) of circumference. Ten thousand men can find place in its upper part. It is divided in three terraces and each terrace is divided in seven storeys. In the four pavilions, there are sculptures to make you marvel. Stones and pearls decorate them" (see also Watters, ii. P 83).

"The kingdom of Nepal is right to the west of Tibet. The inhabitants have the custom to shave their hair just to the level of eye brows. They pierce their ears and suspend therein tubes made of bamboo or horn of cattle. It is a mark of beauty to have ears hanging up to the shoulders. They eat with their hands without using spoons or sticks. All their utensils are made of copper. The merchants there, moving and stationary are numerous ; cultivators rare. They have coins of copper which bear on one side a figure of man and on the reverse a horse (New history ; They have coins of copper which bear on one side a figure of man and on the reverse a horse and a bull, and which have no hole in the middle.) They do not pierce the noses of their bulls. They clothe themselves with a single piece of cloth which envelopes the body. They bathe themselves several times a day. Their houses are constructed of wood. The walls of these are sculptured and painted. They are very fond of Scenic plays, they take part in blowing trumpets and beating drums. They understand fairly well calculation of destiny and researches in physical philosophy. They are equally clever in the art of calendar-making. They adore five celestial spirits and sculpture their images in stone. Each day they wash them with purifying water. They roast a lamb and offer it to sacrifice."

"The king, *Nalingtipo* (Narendradeva) adorns himself with true pearls, rock crystal, mother of pearl, coral, and amber, he has in the ears rings of gold and pendants of jade, and a breloc belt ornamented with the figure of the Buddha. He seats himself on a seat of lions. In the middle of the hall one spreads flowers and perfumes. The nobles and the officers and all the court are seated to the right and to the left on the ground ; at his sides are ranged hundreds of soldiers having arms.

"In the middle of the palace there is a tower of seven storeys with coppertiles. Its balastrade, grilles columns, beams, and everything therein are set with fine and even precious stones. At each of the four corners of the tower there projects a waterpipe of copper. At the base there are golden dragons which spout forth water. From the summit of the tower water is poured through runnels which finds its way down below, streaming like a fountain from the mouth of the golden Makara"[1].

1 Levi ii, P 164-66; JBORS, 1936, P 238-39.

"The father of Naling-ti-po was deposed by his younger brother; Na-ling-ti-po lay hidden to escape from his uncle. Tibet gave him refuge and afterwards established him on his throne; he became in consequence its vassal. In the period of Tching-koan (627-649) Li-I-piao with some military officers was sent as ambassador to India and they passed by this kingdom. Na-ling-ti-po offered him a grand joy; he took Li-I-piao to Aki-po-li, this tank is 20 pales in circumference; the water was boiling constantly. Though it is flowing in current it sweeps confused by hot stones and throws adours of metal. It is neither swelling nor barren. If one strikes with an object, there rises mere vapour and smoke; if you drop cauldron, the dressing is done instantly.

Subsequently when Wang Hiuen-Tse was pillaged by the Indians, Nepal sent cavalries along with Tibet; they fought bravely with Indians, baffled them and obtained suceess. In the second year of the period of Yong-hoei (651) their king Chi-li Nalien-to-lo (Sri Narendra) sent a new ambassador to offer homage and presents".

What had most impressed the Chinese travellers was the very unique commercial position of the country between 646-57 A.D. The development of commerce is a testimony to the lively interest taken by rulers in such matters. Commerce, of course, grew in Nepal to the extent that was allowed by the dispositon of nature and geography on communication and production. There is little prospect of a large scale agricultural development in Nepal owing to the hilly nature of the country and rocky soils in most places. The large tract of uncultivated lands in between Tibet and Nepal must have been noted by the traveller, when they remarked that cultivators were rare in Nepal. Under that limitation the consequent development of commerce took place as it were in consonance with the law of natural division of resources, and of labour. The trade as appears from Yuan Chwang's disclosure mainly consisted of dealing in corns, fruits, copper and yak, all excepting the last produced by itself and which this country sent to Tibet and India in sufficient quantities. The yak Nepal got from Tibet and its role was in this respect to take out *chamars* and export to India as may be inferred from the same. The merchandise was carried by itinerary mer-

chants and handed over to marketing organisations stationed in Tibet and India, who did the disposal business amongst the consumers.

Iron was probably not used by the inhabitants and all works were mainly done by the help of wood and copper, a natural corollary of the same factors of natural limitation, which explains the position with reference to the dearth of the former and abundance of the latter. Silver was rare. The coins were chiefly of copper but to a small extent silver pieces were in cirulation (*Panas* and *Puranas*, See Ins. No. XIII, Levi) despite the rarity of that metal, probably because the country badly needed them for reasons of advanced state of transaction involving rapid exchange of goods.

Unlike what Yuan Chwang himself says about the ugly shape of the people, the T'ang account is definitely eulogising. Nor the assertion of the pilgrim that they were mostly of coarse behaviour and ignorant is accepted by the latter. From the evidence of the T'ang it appears that the people were not only well shaped and good natured but they were also proficient in astrology and science, which shows the high state of cultural achievement attained by the Nepalese at that time.

It is very difficult to discover the causes of these two contradictory accounts in as much as both claim to have been drawn by eye witnesses and therefore seem in no way distracted or distorted on apparent observation, but it is much likely that Yuan Chwang's estimate was based on prejudice which was given rise to by his hatred towards the ritualistic Buddhism in that country and by his first contact with the *Tharus*[1] of the Terai or some other people who are likely to have caused unfavourable impression in his mind by a tendency to ill treat strangers.

The Pagoda Style

The description of the palace of Naling-ti-po, we do not know whether it was a reference to Kailasakuta or to Managriha, may be identified with the style of the buildings which is still present in Nepal

1 The Tharus are the Mongolian people speaking a variety of Hindi language.

and which is wrongly known as the Pagoda style from the name Pagoda borne by temples of such a style in Burma. The style represents temples or houses of hierarchical and sloping roofed houses standing on a pavement, supported by a single or a more similarly hierarchical platforms.

The Pagoda style of architecture was attributed to the Chinese and as such was generally believed to have travelled thence to Tibet and Nepal. (Fergusson: History of Indian and Eastern Architecture, ii, p. 369). But now we have a definitc information from the Chinese sources that up till 646 A.D. there was no like of it to be seen in China. The possibility, therefore, of the style to have travelled from Nepal to elsewhere is more acceptable. In was during the seventh century that the advent was made by this style into Tibet mainly through Nepalese efforts. All credit goes to those who not only produced a new masterly style of architecture but built it such as was gladly copied by others.

The temples or houses in Nepal on the authority of the T'ang history assumed a highly decorating pose on account of the exquisite architectural and artistic designs covering the surface and also because of the beautiful picturesque lining walls inside and the artistic facade and enrapturing mural painting borne by them.

There seem to be little doubt that a large number of temples and chaityas, the latter large mounds of earth with stone pavements of architectural grandeur and on the top surmounted by similarly carved metal roof (Gajur) under a canopy of gold-leaved umbrellas of metal and of larger dimension (chhatri), existed in the valley or outside it. The inscriptions standing in the name of contemporary rulers are testimonies to what these rulers did to construct temples and create endowments, and in addition to what was being done by a number of private people. Most of these temples are buried today undergound, some, of them which are existing, have been preserved in a changed shape, while a few lie demolished and dilapidated and with no remarkability about them at present. In the silence of their tombs and demolished walls and wrecked countenance, however, the inscriptions standing as sentinels remind that at one time they were the objects of attractions of thousands and pride of the place of millions and a sorrowful cry reverberating through the willows growing on the ruins sends a thrill through our

body in imaginative remembrances of that past which was so rich and so beautiful.

For temples and their upkeep the kings maintained a liberal grant, as may be gathered from the inscriptions and if what the inscriptions have conveyed is perfectly true, nobody can deny that Nepal had enjoyed a highest form of cultural progress in those days under the fostering care and patronage of the benevolent rulers.

Cultural Mission to Tibet

The Nepalese contribution to the Renaissance in Tibet in the time of Narendradeva was of immense value to that country. As was the case Nepal helped to polish the language of Tibet and there would be no surprise here, as we know the priority of Newari over almost all the Mongolian languages so far as its origin and its richness and grandeur are concerned. Tibet also derived from its ascociation with Nepal some fundamental advantages of Indian culture. First of all it got the rich Gupta script and then its later development, the decorative *Lantsa.* It is surprising that the Gupta script could find its way in Tibet at a time when it was less in vogue in India itself. It was, however, not a case direct contact with the culture of the Indian plains. The script went from Nepal where it was current since the beginning of the fifth century A. D. Paleographic evidence suggeets that the type of script current in India in the seventh century A. D. was adopted in Tibet. This may explain the variance in the Gupta and Tibetan scripts and also the difference existing in the Tibetan and Manadevite scripts. It must be known that the last are very close to the Gupta scripts whereas the Amsuvarman type are not. Incidentally, therefore, the variation supplies us with one of the strong grounds for dissociating them from the lower dated inscriptions. The second gift of India from Tibet consisted of the whole structural basis of Tibetan religion, the Mahayana Buddhism which was planted on Tibetan soil by dint of Nepalese efforts and affection for that country. We have been used to call it Indian gift not because Buddhism was ushered into Tibet by the people of the plains but because it is a product of that place and India as a whole, otherwise it is no exaggeration to say that in the first stage of Tibetan Renaissance Nepal was the only country to help it in this direction

the people from Vikramshila taking up the thread only after a full hundred years. Sila Manjusri, Buddha Kirti and Bhrikuti had done for Tibet at that time the same services as were rendered later on to Tibetans by Shanti-raksita and Padmasambhava. Even at a late stage, the Nepalese evinced the same keen desire to serve Tibet. Apart from a large number of scholars from Nepal living there, Tibet enjoyed the advantage of securing from Nepal the talents of gifted artists and sculpturists who shaped the present capital of that country and to whom most of the famous temples preserved till now are due. The Pagoda style and the superstitious school of Tibetan painting owe their origin to the valley of Kathmandu. In these fields what Magadha did in regard to the cultural development of Burma and Ceylon, Nepal did to Tibet. Its role in Tibetan renaissance was so magnificent that we cannot afford to forget it so soon[1].

The Route to Tibet

So long the contact with the Asiatic countries was maintained through other routes. As late as 629 A. D. Yuan Chwang had to pass the circuitous route through the Hindukush to get to the frontier of India. Since 639, however, the Banepa-Kuti pass (Banepa is known as Bhotta in Newari. Cf. Ins. No. 13,IA) was opened and with it the collaboration between Nepal and Tibet and between India and Tibet took its materialisation. The closing of this route till that time was a factor to shut Tibet from all events in India. It was really surprising that Tibet so nearer to the frontier of India was kept barbarous and ignorant, whereas China some two thousand miles further north east could imbibe Buddhist culture as early as the second century A. D. The Banepa route offered all facilities to Tibet to learn Indian culture and became the principal thoroughfare of all cultural and commercial contact between the two countries.

Politics.

That in the Vedic and Mauryan times the idea of absolute monarchy was practically unknown has been amply proved by the thesis of Dr. K. P.

1 Nepal then followed the greater vehicle of Buddhism though there were many attached to the lesser vehicle also. Tantric form of worship had not made appearance,

Jayaswal (Hindu Polity, ii, pp 163-97) and accordingly the data in this connection need not be recapitulated here. In those days the monarch was merely an executive head with no absolute powers and was himself subject to dictates of the people as manifest through the Paura or Janapada or even through the council of wise men ( ), which had power to depose or to instal him (Rai Chaudhary: Political History, Pp 260 ff, Pp 276-85).

But as time passed on the forces of absolutism grew triumphant. The oft constitutional slave turned into a moral master and he in turn was elevated into the position of an absolute king responsible to none but to himself. That was the position in the sixth and seventh century A. D. The contribution towards absolutism was made by so many factors, (i) the decline of the *Janapadas,* (2) the line of usurpers who based their sovereignty on divinity, (3) the series of foreign invasions which made it quite necessary to confide in and concentrate power on one man, (4) the idea of unique imperial glory and grandeur under the Guptas, etc. etc. The monarchy in Nepal as stated was a Gupta prototype, and marked the development of factors which had substituted autocracy by the head of the tribe for the democracy in which the tribe participated.

The Government

At the head of the Government was the Maharaja or the Regent or the President as in the time of Amshuvarman. The Maharaja was a hereditary ruler. He was assisted in the administration by his Prime Minister called (महासवदण्डनायक) and (महासर्वप्रतिहार) who combined in himself, the functions of the judicial head and Secretary general. The head of the army was called महाबलाध्यक्ष. The various details of administration were carried by officers designated as भट्टारक पदीय (King's officers) or वार्तृ (salary holders). The samantas were provincial Governors, sometimes holding posts by virtue of their hereditary rights. The diplomatic department was generally held by the king himself or by his son or by one of his favourites.

The above functional distribution of power does not envisage sharing of it with the people, for all these posts were filled by the king by virtue of his prerogatives and he also mainly appointed his officers from the rank of those who were loyal to him. Amshuvarman, however, as

befits a man who rose under circumstances critical and had to usurp power, seemed to look to his subjects as a source of his strength and support so that in his time a definite stage towards the revival of the old type of limited monarchy had appeared near in sight. His address to the people was couched in high respectable terms; he often took the advice of the elders of the country, protected the people from unusual interference of the officials and exacted as little tribute as was only necessary. The ideal of kingship—the fatherhood of ruler and sonhood of subjects, was ungrudgingly followed by him and under him every facility for the encouragement of democratic ideals was earnestly rendered.

The system which he stood for was put out of operation by his successors. The procedure normally developed in the line determined by the peculiarities of circumstances in which Jisnu Gupta or his successors had triumphed. But the rulers were also not so dictatorial as to harbour pretension to a 'olutism and for the matter of that trample down all rights and liberties ol he people. All of them ruled with a show of rod, no doubt, but they strictly followed the tradition and example set by Amshuvarman and there was not much harm done to public cause by their rule. To them then also owed the advancement and prosperity of Nepal of the seventh and eighth century A. D., those precious things which all of us desire at the moment chafing as we are under regular suppression of a tyrannous autocracy, which had only till yesterday sold Nepal to a foreign power at Delhi.

Jisnu Gupta.

Jisnu Gupta's name is entirely omitted by the *vamsabalis*, of the later date. The oldest authority, however, cited by Kirkpatrick (P 262) introduces Gupta dynasty just after the Lichhavis. We have shown the wrong order of the names of the later Guptas as given in the Chronicles. Bhumi Gupta must have flourished in the early part of the seventh century. His successor *Kisnu Gupta* is identified with Jisnu Gupta and as the identification of the next name is easily adduced on account of the same name occurring both in this list and in inscriptions, we have no doubt as to this point. According to Levi K is only a misreading of V (Levi, ii, P 156) Jisnu Gupta was not a Lichhavi as some have wrongly taken him to be[1] (Rai: Dynastic History,

1 Walsh, JRAS, 1908, P 681.

i, P 191). His very name and his reference to the Lichhavi occupant of the throne dismisses such suggestion and Thakuri he was not, so that his Gupta lineage can not be questioned. Jisnu Gupta was a Vaishnavite and all his dedications are made to Visnu (Levi, ii, p 157.)

His inscriptions and coins.

(a) The Thankot inscription. It was discovered in the said village, situated west of Kathmandu. It consists of thirty lines. The subject matter deals with the partial remission of certain public dues. There is a reference to Mana Gupta Gomin, his grandfather. Jisnu Gupta describes himself as belonging to *Chandravansa* (सोमनवय भूषण) and has added almost all the epithets of Amshuvarman (भवतपशुपति भट्टारक पादानुगृहित)
But he has acknowledged the over lordship of the Prince occupying the throne in Managriha (मानगृहात सिंहासनाध्यासि कुलकेतु भट्टारक मानदेव ततपुरस्सर). The record is dated 44, wrongly read 500 by Levi (iii, pp 101-07).

(b) Patan Charter.—This is incised in a stone slab in the temple of Chinamastika in Patan. There is a reference to Sri Maharajadhiraja Amshuvarman about one of the condicts built by him now undergoing repair. Managriha and the king Dhruvadeva Lichhavi are also noted. The last portion being mutilated, his relation with the king is not defined. The date is samvat 48 (=643 A. D.) The dutaka is Yuvaraja Visnu Gupta, his son who is identified by Kirkpatrick.

(c) Minanarayan charter[2] incised on a stoneslab. This was discovered near the temple of Minanarayan on the southern side of Kathmandu. The details are much mutilated. Lines 3 and 4 mention Managriha and *bhattaraka maharajadhiraja Lichhavi kulaketu.* Fleet says that the reference does not imply the overloriship of the prince,

1 IA, ix, P 171 ff ; Fleet, xiv, P 344.
2 IA, Ibid, P 173.

as the term is not Managrihat, and is merely a courtesy address signifying the lineage residing at Managriha. Bhagwanlal believes in the possibility of Lichhavi overlordhip. Next comes the long phrase Dhruvadeva' describing Jisnu as one who freed the people headed by (धवदेव पुरस्सर सकल जन निरुद्रवोपाय संविधानापितै मानस समुपते जगती हिताय) which most certainly is not meant for a courtesy reference only. The subject is, as of the previous inscription, the repair of *tilamakam*, built by Sri Mahasamanta, whose name is mutilated. Basak[1] identifies him with Amshuvarman. The name of the dutaka and the date are peeled off and lost.

(d) Pashupati record. It simply records grants of land made in favour of Munda Srinkhalika Pashupati Acharya Parisad for repairing the temple of chandeswara in the victorious reign of Sri Jisnu Gupta (विजय राज्ये) (IA, IX, P 174)

(e) Coins-His coin bears a winged bull with raised paw on the obverse, but it differs from the lion on Amshu's coins in having the tail hanging down and not curved over the back. The reverse is an elaborately ornamental form of the trident, there is no date (P1, I, Fig 1, Walsh, op. cit.)[1] The period just after 637 A.D. seems to have been attended with a good deal of commotion and upheaval in the political arena of Nepal. According to the *Vansabalis* Amshuvarman was succeeded by Kirtivarman as to begin a new line of rulers in vrtual supercession of the other. In the absence of any authentic records, however, we have no way but to accept the aforesaid evidence as a fact. The Thakuri dynasty till Raghavadeva's succession appears to be either a mere feudatory without having the formal importance of reignal glory or a mere fiction of the chroniclers as far as its royalty goes just to make out an adjustment between the high divergence of years so far unfilled up. The probability

1 OP. Cit, P 261.

of the second factor is more thinkable forteh chronicle seems to care more for years than for names or personalities, as it appears in the particular instance when it has allotted 600 years for six generations coming after Anshuvarman, which cannot be true on any account. Jisnugupta's omission is equally inexplicable.

If Jayaswal's reading of the Thankot inscription is correct, then Jisnu Gupta may be taken to have been ruling in the year 44=639 A. D. under Manadeva III. This Manadeva who is described as the banner of the ruling family (सिहासनाा ध्यासि कुलकेतु) was probably the usurper (referred to in the T'ang history (vide Ante). It can be inferred from the Chinese account that there had arisen a political trouble in 637 or 38 with the result that the father of Narendradeva who is identified by the Pasupati inscription (No 15, IA, IX, P 179) was forced to abdicate and flee to Tibet. The name of the usurper does not occur in the Chinese account. One of Jisnu's inscriptions, however, describes him to have ascended to power owing to the favour of the people and by dint of his high lineage (पुण्यान्वयादागत राजसम्पइ)[1] which may go to show that the succession after Amshuvarman was not determined by constitutional rights but by other fortuitous factors in its favour. In the list of the *Vansabalis* Manadeva comes just after Udayadeva and Dharmadeva is omitted, a fact which in corroborating the name of the successor of Udeyadeva also makes the evidence tally with the account of the inscription and the Chinese history. It seems that Manadeva had played himself in the hands of Jisnu Gupta for his ambition to usurp his brother's place. Udayadeva precedes Jisnu Gupta in the list of MMK also (vide Ante) so that the two years from 637 to 630 may be assigned to him.

There is a controversy as to the lineage of Manadeva. Dr. Indraji and Dr. Basak have dropped him out of their lists altogether. Fleet also in following the former leaves him out. Dr. Jayaswal is of the opinion that he is a Thakuri, son and successsor of Amshuvarman. But Manadeva does not find any mention in the inscriptions of Amshuvarman. He appears only in the Thankot inscription of Jisnu Gupta, where

1 IA, IX, P 173.

the reference to him as 'the banner of the ruling family' has led Dr. Jayaswal to infer that he is not a Lichhavi. We have, however, the evidence of Yuan Chwang that in his time the ruling prince was a Lichhavi[1]. Coupled with this, there is the proof of Dhruvadeva Lichhavi ruling from Managriha the place where Manadevua also resided. If Manadeva had been a Thakuri, the residence would have been Kailasakuta. We know from the inscriptions of Amshuvarman that the sanctity of Managriha was well preserved and there is no reason to believe that Jisnu had reversed this policy and set up a descendant of the Thakuri ruler there. Manadeva must be a Lichhavi on all accounts and only then alone the evidence of the inscription No. 15 can be reconciled.

The voluntary acceptance of Tibetan suzerainty by Nepal probably dates from 639A. D. when Udayadeva as an exile entered into a treaty with that country for securing back his dominion. He was probably the person named Go-cha, father of Bhrikuti of the Tibetan chronicle. The T'ang history is, of course, reticent about the marriage; but it may be taken to have happened during the exile of Udayadeva.

While Udayadeva was erecting a friendly alliance in Tibet, Jisnu Gupta was busy consolidating his power in Nepal. Jisnu had no legal claim to the presidency created by Amshuvarman. He had, therefore, to lean on behind the Lichhavi puppets, and in this process he created two nominal rulers in succeession, while he himself enjoyed the most autocratic and unchallenged powers.

That he did not hesitate to express himself in the most possible royal style may appear from the way he refers to himself, which comes as some stunt to overshadow the personage on the throne. In this attempt he went farther than Amshuvarman, as almost all his inscriptions have addressed him in royal epithet and speak of him to have been ruling hy virtue of his high lineage and meritorious services to the country, which convey a sense of usurpation of the royal throne rather than of the regency or premiership. He also refers to his son, Visnu Gupta as the crown prince, which equally shows his tendency to regard himself as the virtual ruler of the soil. But with all this Jisnu had not the daring

1 Some say that Yuan Chwang's statement that the King was a Lichhavi Bauddha applies to Udayadeva alone.

to ignore the Lichhavi puppet, at least, in matter of formal acknowledgement of his suzerainty, which in the end brought in forces for his own destruction. He stands, therefore, a little defferent from his predecessor inasmuch as the latter had definitely assumed the role of the Head of the State towards his last reign, though his beginning unlike Jisnu's was very humble'.

The Lichhavi Restoration 1

Jisnu Gupta's rule did not last long and he had to give in before a combined attack on his power by Narendradeva and his allies. This event most probably occurred in 643 or 44 A. D. as appears from the T'ang history. Narendradeva brought with him his Tibetan and Chinese friends to Nepal and because of him the Chinese now could establish, for the first time, an amicable political settlement with Nepal and thence with Kanauj whose first Envoy had already reached the court of the Chinese Emperor in 639 A. D. Consequently the first Chinese political mission passed through Deb Patan in 646 A. D. under the leadership of Wang Huen T'se and possibly through the Banepa Kuti route. The T'ang annal says that next year Harsabardhana being dead the Chinese Embassy was molested and tortured by one Arjuna of Kanauj who was probably a Gupta prince ruling in Tirhut at the time and was able to seize the crown after Harsa died. It is said that Wang fled to Nepal and made a united attack on the usurper to avenge the assault. According to the same source Nepal was the most helpful ally and its 7000 soldiers marched hand in hand with the Chinese to destroy the enemy. The T'ang history writes that Arjuna was heavily defeated and was taken prisoner to be deported to China for punishment[2]. In 751 A. D. China received presents from Nepal at the hands of Narendradeva's son[3].

But the invasion also marked the end of Nepal's independence so ably

1 Levi, ii, PP 163-67.

2 JASB, vi, PP 69-70; E. H, 366-67, JRAS, 1869-70 (No. iv) PP 55-60; IA, IX, P 20 (Translation of Julien's Matwalin). According to Matwalin Tibet sent 1000 soldiers, Kamrup 30,000 oxen.

Monahan: Bengal, Past and Present, XIII, P 61. C. V. Vaidya disbelieves the episode (i, 334-35) The king of Nepal was Narendradeva and not Amshuvarman as stated by Fleet and others in GI, i, 190; Levi, ii P 161 ff.

3 Levi, ii, p 161.

defended by Amshuvarman. From that time the Sino-Tibetan domination over Nepal was an accomplished fact and the MMK probably referred to this situation when talking of the Mlechha subjugation after Jisnu-Gupta[1].

The Double Rule.

What is termed as the two *Sircar Rule* in Nepal is an early institution, which had asserted itself prominently during the time of Amshuvarman and Jisnu Gupta. As in the present day, the administration and reignal machineries were owned by seperate dynasties in those days. The Regent or Prime Minister as of now owed nominal loyalty to the throne but otherwise enjoyed the most supreme and absolute authority in the realm as appears from the history of this period.

This kind of double rule certainly obtained long before Jisnu came, probably from the time of the Ahirguptas. This seems to have been the natural culmination of a long srries of infantile reign or of a strong coup d'etat staged in the circumstances by a powerful feudal lord, those very factors which have given rise to a parallel form of government in our time. The double rule, however, had contributed to the weakness of the State inasmuch as it was itself an offspring of the circumstances where feud and bickering were common. But the effect was so serious that the internecine quarrel between the two houses opened the gate for foreign domination as happened after Amshuvarman. The double rule has been always a factor of political and economic ruination of the country and also of exploitation by outside powers for their own purpose at the cost of the prosperity of the country concerned. This is evident from the forementioned chapter of the history of Nepal, which reminds sharply of the consequences. It took some fifty years to recover from the ill effects of this Rule and that also was achieved only when the foreign domination had collapsed in 705 A.D.

Narendradeva's successors

A few names in certain inscriptions stand out unique as those left out both by the *Vansabalis* and the inscription no. 15[2]. About Vikra-

1 MMK, OP. Cit., P 42.
2 IA, no 4, IX, P 164, Bendal, X, 77

masena, the name occuring in the former, we may infer that he did not belong to the Thakuri stock as he comes to the same line as related to Rajaputra Surasena of the earlier inscriptions. About Bhattaraka Skandadeva of the latter inscriptions no doubt can be entertained as to his lineage and date as his inscription amply shows his Lichavi parentage. We have, therefore, two rulers between Narendradeva and Shivadeva II, the last coming probably after Samvat 82 (=688 A. D).

The year 705 A. D.

One of most notable achievements of the Nepalese in this period was the defeat of the Tibetan king in their hands in 705 A. D. From the Chinese history we come to know that the Tibetans had revived their attempt to capture the frontier district of Nepal in 703 A. D. But two years thence they were so heavily defeated that no further attempt was made in that direction after that event. The Tibetan king was killed in the battle[1] (JR AS, 1880, p 435 ff) according to an inscription.

The hero of this battle field is not known from any sources. The T'ang history also had not cared to note him. We have already brought out ample evidence against accepting Dharmadeva in that capacity. If the Thakuri Regent be taken to have fought in that battle it must be Baradeva but his role seems to be of secondary importance as we have Skandadeva in the period after 688 A. D. as the king of Nepal. The latter most probably is the person to have gained the laurels of the battle-field but our verification is limited by absence of any authoritative evidence on that point.

Whoever he may be, the defeat of the Tibetan king enabled the Nepalese to regain their independence, a typical expression of which was the form of address the rulers reserved to themselves now appearing in a more signified and pompous style of *Sri Parama bhattaraka Maharjadhiraja* hitherto unknown in connection with their predecessors[2]. By the time Shivadeva II came to the throne, the consolidation of the home front was

1 Parker in Manchester Journal of the Oriental Society, 1911, PP 129-52, Missionary Journal, China, 1904 ; Asiatic Quarterly Review, 1910.

2 Dr Rai endorses the view of Levi that the provision of transport service for Bhot is a proof of the obligation borne by Nepal towards Tibet as the latter's vassal (DNI, 1, p 193)

complete and all vestige of foreign rule was withdrawn, which is noted triumphantly by the MMK in the words that "Shaivism was reintroduced, Sanskrit was restored and the spirit for the veneration of cows and Brahmans enlivened."

About Shivadeva whom we may call the second we have three inscriptions, of which the two are dated. If the first of them be taken to be the oldest, his date as stated in that inscription falls in Samvat 119. Now to what era this date be referred to? Those who believe that the era of Amshuvarman was followed by the successor attribute the epoch to 596 A. D. But they seem to have missed the point that Jayadeva II Shivadeva's son only a hundred and ten years after Amshuvarman's death has omitted reference to his name, though in the same context, profuse praise is lavished on the Lichhavi Kings reigning previous to himself by three hundred years. This is very important for the epoch of the era of Shivadeva II's or Jayadeva II's inscriptions, as not only the Thakuri lineage of these two rulers is hereby disproved but also at this stage doubt can be entertained as regards the Thakuri epoch of the era in their inscriptions, because we find that relationship with the Thakuris is altogether disowned in the inscriptions. Our doubt is further strengthened by the marital relationship of Shivadeva II with Bhogavarman Maukhari, which brings in the possibility of Harsa era to have been followed at that time in substitution of the era founded by Amshuvarman. The Lichhavis must have seen and made sure that no amount of dishonour attaches to them on any account and that for ensuring such an unstained position they had to, at least, remove the principal vestige of the Thakuri rule, that was their era. The Lichhavis then probably had a notion that the Thakuris had eclipsed them. In fact when Aditya Sen's inscription reveals the adoption of Harsa era (GI, Text PP 208-10) it is quite logical that his grandson in Nepal might have not hesitated to follow in his footsteps for his own sake[1] and, therefore, his father's inscription, too, may be referred to the epoch of the Harsa era. It is now clear that in imitation of his father-in-law Shivadeva II had adopted the Harsa era for his reign.

1 Levi, ii, PB 167-68.

Their Records.

(a) Lagantole address. This is incised in a black stone slab in the temple of Visnu in Lagantole, southern suburb of the city of Kathmandu. The stone has in the upper portion a semi-circular shape and inscribed within the arch are the relief images of Kailasa and Nandi. The charter is issued from the *Kailasa kuta bhavana* in the name of Shivadeva II with the epithets *Bhattaraka Maharajadhiraja*. The dutaka is Rajaputra Jayadeva. The record is dated samvat 119+606—07=725—26 (IA, iX, P 175). Managriha was then in a dilapidated state, and it was no longer occupied[1].

(b) Pashupati grant-This was found inscribed in a stone slab at the southern gate of Pashupati. The record is damaged, the date of issue and the name of the king are illegible. The subject matter is the grant of land to the monastery named Shivadeva Vihara. The date has been read by Fleet and Bhagwanlal as 143=748 A. D. It is believed that the record belongs to Shivadeva II (IA, IX. P 176). The charter is issued from probably referring to the name of (*Bhadradibasa Bhavana*).

(c) Chasatol inscription. This was discovered near the stupa of Ashoka in Patan. The record is in prose and its orthography agrees with that in Amshu's inscriptions. The various names of Gosthis, now called Goothi occur in the portions referring to the boundaries of the grants. The date is samvat 137 with the dutaka Bhattaraka Jayadeva (Levi, iii, 112-18)

(d) Thimi inscription-Thimi is two miles west of Bhatagaon in between Kathmandu and this town. The record deals with a contribution to be made by the villagers. The date is lost. The dutaka is Rajaputra Jayadeva (118-139).

1 It seems Shivadeva began his reign from Kailasakuta bhavana.

(e) Yagbahal inscription of Patan. This is issued from the same place as the inscription (b) of our order in the name of *Lichhavi Kulaketu Paramabhattaraka Maharajadhiraja... deva*, the two letters preceding *deva* are lost the letters occurring with the place of issue are common to (b) and (c), the latter is also taken to have belonged to Shivadeva II. The subject of the epigraphy is the grant made to the fraternity of the Buddhist monks coming from all quarters and living in Shivadeva Vihara. There is an allusion to Manadeva-Vihara, Kharjurika Vihara, Yama Vibara, Abhayaruchi Vihara, Varta Kalyana Gupta Vihara, Chaturbhalankasana Vihara, and Sriraja Vihara [Levi, iii, (139-45)]

(f) Minanath Patan inscription. The date is samvat 145=751—52 A.D. The name of the king is lost ; but the dutaka's is preserved by another name, Vijayadeva. Dr. Bhagwanlal says that this name is a vicarious name of Jaydeva II and, therefore, ascribes the record to Shivadeva II. Fleet, however, takes it as a name of Jayadeva's son and pushes the record down to the reign of Jayadeva II.

(g) Inscription no. 15 of I. A. belonging to Jayadeva II. This is the last of the series but the most important of all. It is dated Samvat 153=759—60. The importance of the record is due to the fact that it gives the genealogy of Jayadeva's ancestors. The earliest reference is to Supuspa of Pataliputra, who flourished twenty-three generations previous to Jayadeva (I). After Jayadeva I followed eleven unnamed kings. Then the following order is given.

Vrsadeva
Shankaradeva
Dharmadeva
Manadeva
Mahideva
Vasantadeva

The next verse which has been subjected to confusion of reading on account of certain letters fading away in the epigraph has been already dealt with in another place of the present discourse. Let us, therefore, proceed with the conclusion arrived at in that connection. After Vasantadeva eleven kings ruled in succession and then came Udayadeva being succeeded by his son Narendradeva "bowed by all the kings who took the dust of his feet" (verse 11). His successor (the relationship is not defined) was Shivadeva who was a conqueror of enemies and protector of his subjects, He married the daughter of the Maukari king Bhogavarman, who was a grand-daughter of the Magadha King Adityasena- This princess Vatsadevi gave birth to the great Jayadeva who called himself *Parachakrakama.* (IA, ix,p 178 ff ; GI, 186-87 ; Basak, P 270) Jayadeva married the daughter of Gauda king[1].

The restoration of the Lichhavis was attended with widespread prosperity in political and cultural sphere. Nepal had just got clear of its foreign rulers, under whose sway this country chafed for about half a century. Politically the victory over Tibet had a consequence of enhancing its reputation abroad and at the same time contributed to its own consolidation at home. There was also an end of the process of double rule now that the Thakuris had sunk themselves into disrepute, so that free from domestic and external dangers, Nepal could record a high level of prosperity as in the time of Amshuvarman.

This period can be compared favourably with that of Amshuvarman. The kings as it were treading in the footsteps of Amshuvarman wisely refrained from reversing what had been done in the past in cultural and political spheres. The administration was run much in the same way as before. Toleration and piety formed the foremost rules of conduct in the court. The kings, though themselves, Shaivites rendered obedience to Buddha and other Mahayana deities while even the most common privileges enjoyed by the Viharas and monks was zealously guarded. Economically the restoration of the original position of Nepal as the minter of the Himalayan country prepared the ground for speedy recovery from the past slump and from the state of devastation and ruin which accom-

1 Jayaswal probably did not care to note the word Parachakrakama, when he says that Jayadeva was not given the full title of sovereignty (P 249 50)

panied the wars and foreign domination. All these vanished as the lightning, while the adoption of the old policy of agriculture and irrigation as prevailing in the time of Amshuvarman paved the way for the establishment of an all round economic prosperity on sound footing[1].

Those who refuse to accept the above fact of revival of independence and prosperity argue that it was just the time when Nepal was again under Tibetan suzerainty (levi, ii, 171-77) They, however, forget the situation in which Tibet was put after 705 A. D., which was responsible for the subsequent defeat the latter suffered in 769 A. D. at the hands of the Kashmiri king. Torn in the midst of internecine strife and itself faced with a calamity iminent and dangerous, Tibet was not in a position to lead any crusade against the southern neighbour. Nepal on the other hand had emerged triumphant out of the very chaos which was engulfing Tibet at this time, viz, the threat of foreign invasion. The historical episode of how the Nepalese king could inflict a defeat on the sovereign of Kashmir as narrated in Rajatarangini is too clear an evidence to lead us to think otherwise on the subject. And we have no doubt that the achievement reflects credit on the ruling Lichhavi king Jayadeva II who is undoubtedly the monarch referred to therein.

The account given by Kalhana is as follows. In the year 782 A. D. the throne of Kashmir passed into the hands of Jayapida who being inbued with the most exceptional daring and ambitions aspirations entered upon an adventurous carrer of conquest and in the first stage could conquer a large portion of northern and central India. His expansion, however, was checked subsequently after by the intervention of the king of Nepal who succeeded in defeating and imprisoning him, and would let him off only when the latter surrendered a huge ransom and pledged words of absolute loyalty to himself.

According to Rajatarangini the battle was fought on the bank of the rivev kala Gandak, called locally Kaligancaki at present. Kaligandaki is the name which Gandak bears in the Himalayas so the centre of the fight must occur somewhere on the hills near about *Ridi* which

1 See Inscriptions (Levi, xx ; IA, IX, No 13).

is a very important place on the western part of Nepal even today[1]. The king's name, however, which is given as Aramudi cannot be identified.

Prof. Levi with his innate prejudice to give credence to anything glorifying Tibet, (ii, 176) attributes the victory to the then Tibetan king by interpreting the name Aramudi as a Tibetan word, V. Smith (P 387) and Stein (Tv. Vol. i, 95) have followed suit much at the cost of Kalhana's evidence. We have already said as to how the scene of the battle and its place exactly fit in with the town of Ridi apart from the name of the river which suggests an unquestionable identity with the present Kaligandak in Western Nepal. Further the historian who exhibits all praise for the Nepalese valour and achievement more than once is least expected to commit so trivial a mistake as to entertain a confusion between Nepal and Tibet, two entirely separate countries with two entirely separate names[2].

Rajatarangini verses 531 —553[3].

"The Raja named Aramudi, skilled in magic, protector of Nepal, endowed with the arts of peace and war planned to overreach him (531). When Jayapida entered his principality he did not make his submission but retired from before him to a great distance with his army (532) Thus it was that he who was ambitious to conquer inflicted while in parsuit of Aramudia[4], defeats on the various ruling princes which would have necessitated special efforts to achieve (533). He proceeded in each country to search the enemy who was in hiding somewhere and was occassionally visible just like to the hawk the

1 Ridi is only a few miles west of Palpa on a hill site overlooking the River Gandak. It is a summer seat of the Nepalese district head of Palpa. It is also a sacred place where many go to die and those who cannot may have the posthumous satisfaction of ashes being burnt in the common pyre Here *Saligram* the black deified stone is found.

2 JBORS, 1936, iii, pp. 251-53; According to P. Landon the account has also the backing up of legends in Kathamandu, but I know no thing of this legend.

3 Translation by R.S. Pandit, P. 142—44.
Jayaswal identified Aramudi with Bardeva of Bendal's chronicle (Nep. Cat. p. 21). The chronicle relates a story about Varadeva's life of renunciation as a monk and attributes to him the victory over Karkotanaga. Jayaswal says that Armudi in Kasmiri means monk and karkota is the dynasty of Jayapida the account refers to the fight which Varadeva had with Jayapida.

pigeon in the thicket (534). Then when he had exhausted the perilous adventures while engaged in conquest up to the horizon he planted his army on the bank of river which was in the vicinity of the ocean (535). At this time on the further bank of the river on the right of the king was found posted Aramudi displaying his army with the emblem of his own parasol (537). Seeing his powerful army which resounded with the rattle of massed kettle drums Jayapida flared up like fire which has absorbed melted butter (538). He on seeing that the river water which was knee deep was no impediment in his anger plunged in to cross unacquainted with the terrain as he was fromn ever having been before (539). When the king had reached the middle the river was filled by the rising tide and unexpectedly became unfathomably deep with the waters (54)[1].

The king's army teeming with men, phants and horses sinking in the river, which was rising in that manner, in a trice came to an end (541) The king whose ornaments and clothes were torn off in the rushing waves, penetrated the waves with his arms and was carried off far by the flood waters (542) with the pitiful shrieks of the one army, the triumphant shouts of the other and with the roar of the waves of the river the direction became full of tumult (543) The enemy made haste and with armed men on inflated skins he drew out Jayapida from the midst of the river and took him prisoner and held a feast (544) on the bank of the Kal Gandaka in a very high stone he put Jayapida into the hands of guards who were in his confidence (546). Thus the Kashmiri king was once more submerged in adversity and, puzzled as to what should be done, was consumed by concealed sorrow (447). The wise Rajah so guarded him that among the artful not even the moon and among the brilliant not even the sun could see him (541) "Together with the fortune of Jayapida I shall deliver to you the throne of the king of Kasmir" thus through the emissaries Armudi heard the message (553) when upon the arrival of the emissaries of the opposite side the agreement was complete."

The status of Nepal contrary to what some scholars have held seems to have undergone a great change for the better during the eighth century A. D. The Napalese king for the first time in the history of

1 OP. Cit p 254.

Nepal was admitted into the fold of the Kshatriyas and could woo the hands of a kshatriya Princess of the plains. The Maukhari king offered his daughter to Shivadeva II and the Gauda king gave his daughter in marriage to Jayadeva II. Thus a new chain of marital alliances set up a new grouping of powers, which definitely classed the ruling dynasty of Nepal with the noble dynasties of India. those very dynasties which would have simply refused to have anything to do with those in distress and disgrace, least of all with those suffering under Mlechha tutelage.

We are not ready to take each word of the poet who composed the verses of the inscription of Jayadeva II even in it face value or something conveying the entire truth. Much seems to have been inserted by a way of decoration or beautification generally as a mode of figurative speech, which undoubtedy expresses the fact in a manner likely to give a bright painted picture of a thing in spite of the factual embodiment underlying the expression, sometimes even in quite antagonism of the latter. The claim of the grantee as to his severeignty of the whole of North India erroneously believed by some (Basak, P 280) to have represented the correct status of his royalty cannot be accepted without reservation as we have another evidence to the contrary. But his all powerful position in Nepal itself is best subject to doubt and should not be construed as a mere indulgence of a poet, for it is evident that the composer with all his exaggerated estimate of the king's conquest has not used the word Sarbabhauma (sovereignty) in the sense otherwise than what it really means in so far as it was applicable to Nepal and its dependencies in the Terai under the circumstances.

The contact with India was kept up through more than one channel, the marriage relation being one of them. In culture, education and trade, Nepal identified itself with the major current of forces in the plains and specially of those countries whose boundary lay conterminous. As before the intimate connection of the time remained as firm as ever with the powers in Pataliputra and Gauda, with whom the Nepal kings had entered into matrimonial alliance we have just noted. It is possible that these had helped them to regain their position in Nepal as well as consolidate forces in the Terai, now that the dread of invasion from thenorth had vanished for ever with Tibet as

the vassal probably enjoying a status parallel to what has come to be under the present Tibeto-Nepalese treaty.

The best testimony to the continuity of the Lichhavi dynasty for another long period of years is provided by the coinage of this period, which unfortunately till now had been ascribed to the earlier regimes and to different names. We know from the history of the Nepalese coinage that there is a type of coins with the legend Sri Pashupati, after whom they are known today. These coins have been rightly assigned to the eighth century A. D. both by Dr. V. Smith[1] and E. A. Walsh[2]. two foremost Numismats; but under a queer idea of Nepalese coinage and working on the evident of the irregular paleography other Inoflogists have confusingly misplaced them a century earlier.

The six specimens of coins according to the above opinion represent the six Lichhavi kings from Shankardeva onwards, whom they have placed in the latter part of the seventh century A. D. This, however, does not seem to be a right inference not only for the misplacement of these rulers but also because the Pashupati coins if properly considered represent kings having the name in words synonymous with Pashupati, the God Siva implying their devotion to the cult of Pashupatinath, rather than those whose allegiance to even Shaivism is doubtful and whose dates under all circumstances belong to previous centuries. Apart from that the epigraphy of the coin is a strong factor to determine their place in the eighth cenury, which of course may also be brought into effect a consonance with the erroneous arrangement if they are assigned a place in that century. But as two allied authorities simultaneously are not expected to issue coins in the same place, which position it would amount to if we ascribe them to rulers in the above order, we have either to deny paramouncy to Shivadeva II and his successors or to dismiss the existence of the former kings altogether from our proviso

1 C. I. M., P. 280-82.

2 OP. Cit, P 681. There are six varieties of these coins. (1) On the obverse recumbent bull to left, reverse shows sun surrounded by rays (2) same on the obverse, Nandipada trisula opposite (3) Humped bull wtth crescent above, reverse sun with rays (4) on the obverse Trident with and axe attached to the shaft on the left, some ornament hanging from the right on the reverse (5) same with trident but without axe (6) on the obverse seated figure of a king wearing a crown and on the reverse vase of flowers. These coins were found in Buddha Gaya as votive offerings.

so that the latter get their due credit. And as Shiva II and Jaya II have to their advantage the unassailable proof of their paramountcy expressed through their inscriptions, we have no other way save to recognise their position as such, and the coins only supplement the evidence to that effect. The coins belong to them and their two predecessors who were also devotees of Shiva and there can be no two opinions on that point. On that inference the two other types must belong to two of Jayadeva's successors. These coins also testify that the Lichhavis had at this stage maintained the name unmitigated royalty and honour, reputation and grandeur as was the case in the last period.

CHAPTER IV

MEDIEVAL AGE

This period covers eight hundred years of Nepalese history from the time of Raghavadeva to that of the Pre-Gorkha Malla Karnatakas.

Sources.

These extend over a vast and varied field of inscriptions, genealogical surveys, manuscript works, foreign accounts and coins. There are seven inscriptions including two of Pratapamalla (1632-1680), and one of Siddhinarsinha, his contemporary in Patan[1]. These inscriptions have been found to supplement the evidence of the MS. works as regards regnal data (years) and also to supply relative information about particular reigns. The *Chronicles* are also altogether seven, of which the four which constitute the group used variously by Wright,[2] Levi,[3] Bhagwan Lal Indraji[3] and Kirkpatrick[5] with the exception of the last have been declared untrustworthy[6]. They have been found lacking in accuracy of facts and figures. They have indulged in introducing unreal dynasties and have made a great confusion between them and also as regards dates of contemporary rulers who are placed one after the other irrespective of their actual dates. An idea of this misplacement may be obtained from one instance and this is regarding the Nanyadevites and Vamadevites who were contemporary rulers as

1 Indian Antiquary, vol. ix, pp 184 ff.
2 Edited by Wright, 1877—Translated from Parbatiya by Munshi Shewshanker.
3 Levi, Le Nepal, 'Historic du Nepal', Ch. II.
4 IA, XIII, p 4II ff.
5 Account of the Kingdom of Nepal, p 254 ff.
6 See also H. C. Rai, The Dynastic History of India, pp. 185-232.

verified a by MS. but are placed one after the other in a manner that the difference amounts to nearly two hundred years[1]. The chroniclers suffered from a lack of definite knowledge on the subject and also from an obsession that they have insufficient materials and lists in their hands, which certainly did not cover the five thousand years of *Kaliyuga* they wanted to connect their history with. It was to them quite necessary in order to keep up the national reputation of their past chivalry that this history was to be associated with the *Mahabhara*[2]. So the fact of contemporaneity was sacrificed and Kings who ruled at one and the same time were made to rule at periods very distant from each other. But this alone could not suffice, for with the limited number of names and under ordinary calculation of regnal years there comes a big gap otherwise remaining unfllled up. Accordingly, they took a recourse to lengthening reign periods, sometimes even 90 years were allotted and thereby the adjustment was effected. But all these have rendered the whole chronology unreliable. We have rulers ruling only three years according to MS. works but the same are given 20 or 30 or 40 by the genealogies[3]. We have all rulers down to Harisimhadeva antedated by fifty or sixty or hundred or even five hundred years as we go upwards[4]. King Bhojadeva who ruled in the eleventh century A. D. according to a MS. is placed three hundred years earlier in 783 A.D.[5] Nanyadeva's invasion occurring in 1119—20 A.D. is wrongly antedated by two hundred years and to give one more instance, the epoch year of the Nepal era is placed during Nanya's time, though it is referred to the year 811 (+79=890 A.D.) of the Saka era notwithstanding that it makes the whole assertion self contradictory[6]. All the four chronicles have these defects. But the three are even worse than Kirkpatrick's authority;

1 See for full criticism IA, XIII, p 413 ff; Levi, ii, p.87 ff; i, p 202 ff.

2 A Great war fought in India between the two powers of Kuru and Pandavas No authentic evidence is available bearing on this war. The Nepal vansabalis attribute to one of the names of the Kirata dynasty a gallant heroism on that occasion. But only three generations after it brings Buddha in the scene, which proves beyond doubt that the chronicler had no idea of the date of Buddha or Ashoka and least of the date of Mahabharata.

3 Wright p 138, Bendal, Nep. Cat. (Intro) p 29,

4 *Ibid.* p 175 ; *Ibid,* p 29.

5 *Ibid.* p 156 ; *Ibid,* p. 29.

6 *Vide* below.

for the latter has at least shown a tendency to accuracy of chronological order in contrast to others which are full of mistakes in this matter as well. Again they labour under particular partiality of treatment of subject matter, which leans towards Buddhistic legend in Wright[1] and Bhagwan Lal's authorities and to Brahmanical legends in Levi's work[2]. This partiality and extreme proneness to adopt legends as facts have in the end infected the few authentic details so that on the whole, they are historically valueless.

Very distinct from these, however, are the three *chronicles* discovered by C. Bendal in the Nepal library. These have withstood the test and verification conducted with reference to MS. data and were found correctly tallying save only in minor details[3]. The best merit attached to these comes out of the fact that they were written in Ns. 505 (=1395 A. D.) so that the account they give must be based on reliable evidence as naturally as it is readily supposed. For a description of the *Vamsabalis* it must be stated here that the three in fact are only three divisions of one work written by a single individual but disjoined owing to the difference of period they profess to deal with. The first, of course, surveys the whole period from the beginning of the Nepal Era down to 1395 A. D. but the second and third only supplement each other, the former giving only dates of royal birth from Ns. 177 to Ns. 396 is followed by the latter up to Ns. 595 with more details. In spite of certain drawbacks they suffer on account of wide grammatical mistakes, they have in Bendal's words, put matters in a new light, and as such have immense value for the student of Nepal history[4].

But the most valuable historical material in matter of chronology ever obtained is the group of MSS. which constitutes the sole evidence for verifying the data of the *Vamsavalis* in well ascertained manner[5].

1 Wright, Preface.
2 Levi calls his Vamsabali as *Brahmanipue V.* In spite of it being written by a Brahman, it bears close analogy to the Buddhist work. Possibly one is a copy of the other.
3 C. Bendal, Nepal Cat. Intro. pp 1—4
Ibid.
4 Ibid.
5 See Hara Prasad Sastri's preface to the same; also Bendal's introduction to his Cambridge catalogue.

Hardly need it be said that but for these MSS. the value of the various *Chronicles* could not have been judged. The data supplied in the colophon are so far the only reliable evidence for the particular time or reign they were written. They are very brief but furnish the evidence in unfailingly correct way and thus far they are of immense utility to students. These MSS. are in the main deposited in the Maharaja's library in Kathmandu. They are not accessible to the public. A catalogue, however, prepared by Bendal and Hara Prasad Sastri fulfils the present need as they have not omitted the *colophons* in the Catalogue. Apart from that Mr. Bendal has added a summary of the main incidents noted in the *Vamsabalis* in his introduction to the same volume[1]. This and his MS. collection[2] of the Cambridge Library have also helped a great deal to arrive at a solution of the problem[3].

Another valuble material has appeared from Chinese and Tibetan notices mentioned chiefly in the contemporary histories of the period, which M. Levi so laboriously collected from the Yuan and Ming annals. These he has noted in detail in his book 'Le Nepal' and also in various issues of the Journal Asiatique, to which I have made a reference in particular places. The three *chronicles* of Bendal have been referred to as V' V'' and V''' respectively on the line indicated by their discoverer[4].

For the three chronicles we are indebted to Cecil Bendal whose idefatigable zeal for MS. research has borne the fruit in the shape of the above noted materials and the number of MS. works, to which Hara Prasad Shastri's valuable catalogue prepared for the Nepal Library has only supplemented[5]. While the student of Nepalese history acknowledges

1 This appeared at first as an article in the Journal of the Bengal Asiatic Society 1903, (Nos. 1 and 2), Part I, LXXII. His Journey to Nepal (1886), is another indispensable historical treatise.

2 This is published in a separate volume in 1902 under the title Catalogue of Sanskrit MSS. in British Museum.

3 We have further the Hodgeson collection and D. Wright's collection (JRAS. 1876, VIII, 1—52). The following works also are useful: R. Lal Mitra's Sanskrit Buddhist Literature of Nepal. The MSS. noted in Hunter's 'Life of Hodgeson', 1881 and the Leipzig collection.

4 JASB ibid, p. 4 (CPMDW Intro.)

5 The Catalogue is the result of joint labour. It was published in 1905 under the title 'A Catalogue of palm leaf MSS. in the Durbar Library Nepal.' I have used its abbreviated title C. P. M. D. N. following H. C. Rai.

gratefulness to these people, he is reminded at once of equally great and beneficent services of M. Levi whose monumental work 'Le Nepal' stands as a beacon light to future historians. His work is all embracing and is the pioneer volume to open the great treasure of the past of the little but proud mountainous country. But we remember him mostly for excavating Chinese materials, which are the only foreign accounts, available now on the much controversial problem of Nepalese chronology[1].

Last but not the least and equally important are the various clay coins, copper coins and silver coins, which stand in the same relation to period after 1600 A. D. as the MSS. stand to the time before[2]. The Nepalese history from 800 A. D. to 1600 A. D. is conspicuous, as Jayaswal calls by 'the absence of coinage'[3]. One does not know as to how the economic life of the people could function without the medium of exchange. Probably a solution may be offered by bringing in the Pashupati coins or by ignoring the independent status of Nepal in that period as some people have sought to do. But mere fact of coinage is unable to explain the status of a particular country. To take an example as we have it the basis of separate coins were to be accepted the Pre-Gorkha period of Nepalese history as independent though it was a vassal of the Moghal Empire and weakened and torn by most unhealthy division in the circumstances. Irrespectively, however, the coins form a connecting link with the MSS. and do provide for us a good and strong ground for the fixation of dates to the reigns after 1630 A. D.

Raghavadeva.

How far Jayadeva II's kingdom had been maintained intact is not known except that a few rulers whose identity and contemporaneity are

1 Levi's Chinese accounts are taken from the Annals of the Ming and Yuan noted with full reference at particular places in this article, His book on 'Nepal as well as the number of articles he wrote for 'Journal Asiatique' being in French there has been some difficulty regarding the proper estimate of the book by those who lack knowledge of the French language

2 'Walsh, Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1908, pp. 677 ff; V. Smith, Catalogue of Coins in Indian Museum 1906', 1, pp. 281 ff; Cunningham, Coins of Ancient India, p XIII, Hoernle JBAS proceedings, May 1887. K. P. Jayaswal; JBORS 1936, p 3, III, p 267.

3 Prof. Rapson's 'Indian coins' in Indo-Arischer philologie und Altertumskunde.

equally doubtful are brought to the scene by the *Vamsabalis* to have ruled in the valley as successors of the Lichhavis. In fact the whole history between Jayadeva II and Raghavadeva is wrapped up in obscurity. About Raghavadeva himself little is known from the chronicles. He is not mentioned by the Buddhist legends. Kirkpatrick is the only authority to make him the founder of the Nepal Era[1]. Similary about Raghavadeva being a Thakuri we have no other authority than Kirkpatrick and Bendal[2]. But the latter having got hold of trustworthy documents may be relied on. The point, however, is that the chronicles have to be regarded the sole authority in this matter and theirs is the last word. It is not known when the last of the previous dynasty ceased to function as a ruler, instances of double rule being age old and very common, the rise and fall of a particular dynasty is subject to utter confusion. But if Raghavadeva were to be regarded as a Thakuri, to which the account of the New Era under him directs a pointer, he must also be regarded as the first of the restored line so that the four rulers preceding him stand in the old order[3].

The fact of the Nepal Era beginning in the year 879-80 is not only important for reasons stated above, but it stands as the pivot for all the dates beginning from that year in view of the large scale manuscript works available for that period, which has rendered the fixation of data for the respective reigns almost very easy.

Raghavadeva is not mentioned in other Vamsabalis except that of Kirkpatrick, but as regards the origin of the era in 879-80 no manner of doubt can be entertained as the MSS. coming in only a hundred and fifty years after, have attested the founding of the era in that year[4]. Each colophon of the MS. also tallies with the statement of the authoritative *chronicles* of Bendal. Formerly when these evidences were absent, historians were prone to base their conclusions on the fantastic assertions of the first group of the chronicles which placed the reign of Nanyadeva as to have occurred only nine years after the epoch of the

1 Kirkpatrick, p 261.
2 Bendal, IBAS 1903, Table, p 21.
3 See Wright, p 153. He omits Raghavadeva but other names have been found to correspond with those in Bendal, list.
4 Bendal, Nep. Cat, JBAS, p 21.

New Era, though illogically the same authority attributed the Era to Jayadevamalla ruling (10+25)=35 years previous[1]. For Nanyadeva we have records in Mithila and, therefore, the baseless character of this assertion and of many others is too glaringiy proved to require further explanation. For the Nepalese history of this period Mr. Bendal's researches have enabled us to arrive at correct chronological data and detect the very incongruous estimates of the worthless documents[2].

Consideration of the new Era.

The present year is the 1072nd year of the Nepal Era according to the Newari Calendar. The Newar month begins in the bright fortnight and ends with the last day of the dark fortnight. It is lunar as well as *Amanta.* The New Year day falls on the first day of the bright fortnight of Kartika.

On the Amanta feature of the Era much has been discussed by learned writers like Fleet[3], E. Kielhorn[4], and M. Levi[5]. One author, Rai Bahadure Gauri Shankar Ojha,[6] believed that as it was brought by Nanyadeva it had evidently the character of a Southern Era. So far as Nanyaddva's cennection with the Era is concerned, it has been already proved that he was brought in the field according to the wrong estimate of the Vamsabalis, and in fact as the MSS. dating 1007 A. D. have shown, the Era existed two hundred years earlier. The latter part of the statement also should not unnerve us, for, we have it on the basis of an inscription of Amshu, the *Sundhara* inscription, that the Amanta Calendar was actually followed in Nepal

---

1 Wright, p 167; I A, XIII, p 412 ; Levi, II. pp 175-79.

2 Bendal's Table, contrast it with Wright : Dr. H. C. Rai also has produced a rearranged list in his 'Dynastic History of India', I, pp. 1230-32 (1931). This book gives a thorough delineation of the chronology of the period.

3 Gupta Inscriptions, C I I,, 3, p 74.

4 Journal of Bengal Asiatic Society, XVII, 1888, Sept., pp 246 ff.

5 M. Levi, ii, pp. 179—84. Levi says that it is only an editon of the Saka Era. But how can it be so when we see that it was not in vogue before the time of Bhojadeva. The ending 79 has led him to guess that the year was counted by hundreds, the eight hundred previous to 79 being taken as 8. Also see H. C. Rai's Dynastic History of India, ii, p 194.

6 Prachin Lipimala, (Hindi), p 38.

for times immemorial[1]. It may be noted here that Aryabhatta's old Siddhanta still held the field. The basic source of the era accordingly will have to be sought elsewhere.

The year 879 A. D.

The month of October of the year 879 A. D.[2] i. e., of the first year of the Nepal Era must be a very important month, if what we have stated in connection with the founding of the Era in that year is true. So far as the Brahman or Buddhist Vamsabalis are concerned they have retained cryptic silence as regards the occasion of the epoch. We can, however, imagine that the Era must have been related to some great event as the commemoration intended by the epoch does so imply. It is certainly not the defeat of the Tibetans, which it seeks to convey, as that took place nearly one hundred and fifty years back. Of all the writers M. Levi alone believes that the Tibetans held Nepal up till 879 A. D., in which year Nepal extricated itself from the clutches of its enemies. He has, of course, no evidence to fall on in the T'ang history[3]. He does so on the ground that he finds the expansion of Tibet in the north and north-west as far as Khotan in that century under the Commandership of Khristrongbilson. But Tibet had a check in the south and once the invasion was a disastrous failure, it could not have been directed to that side. This is the only conclusion we can arrive at if the probability of independence from Tibet be taken into account.

Another explanation of Levi that the Era came to be adopted quite accidentally or because the number eight was inauspicious, eight here probably in terms of the Saka Era, seems as much untenable as no authoritative evidence can be built on such a superstition prevailing amongst the Newars or amongst the people of Nepal in general. Nor, it was a version of the Saka Era enumerated according to *Lokakala*[4].

---

1 IA, XV, p. 38 ; see K. P. Jayaswal. JBORS 1936, p 166, iii.

2 CSBM., pp 147, 151, 168 ; Bendal, Journey, p. 80 ; I. A., IX, p. 183. Read the above for the Amanta and to know that the Era commenced with Vikrama Era 937 expired. Kirkpatrick's vamsabali states that Raghavadeva founded a Vikramajit Era. But it was not the Era we have in view here. Hence Prinsep and Cunningham attributed the new Era to Raghava. See useful Tables, 1858, p. 269, and Indian Eras, p. 74.

3 Levi, ii, pp. 178—79.

4 Levi's view. See also Epigraphica Indica Baijnath Prasasti 1, pp. 107-15.

What appears to be the right cause of the era is the fact of Thakuri restoration. We learn from the inscriptions—and this has been established beyond doubt that Amshuvarman founded a Thakuri Era in 595 A. D.[1] At that date the Lichhavis were carving out a precarious existence in the valley and as the king happened to be too much dependent on the Premier, i. e., on Amshuvarman, he was relegated in the back-ground. But after Amshuvarman the Thakuris lost power and it was not until 879 A. D. that they could regain it[2]. That year marks the end of the Lichhavi rule as well as the restoration of the Thakuri dynasty. The chronicles on the whole have made a mistake in putting Raghava in the old list of Thakuris[3]. Thakuri he was but the list contains all Lichhavis who are wrongly called Thakuris. In fact the names down to Raghavadeva must be removed to the first list under the caption No. II, i. e., the second line restored by Udayadeva. That Raghava's line was a new line is indicated by V' which begins entirely a new chapter, in fact, a new *genealogy* commencing with him. Bendal points out that this indicates unlike the other Vamsabalis a break in the old order and necessarily has to be commemorated by founding the era. (JBAS, 1903, Part I.)

The First dated MS.[4]

Unfortunately no dated MS. exists for the time of Raghavadeva. The first MS. dates Nepal Era[5] (*Nepala Samvat*) 128 (=1007 A. D.) copied in the reign of Nirbhayadeva and Rudradeva, joint rulers[6]. The next *MS. Astasahasrika prajnaparamita* gives a joint rule under three monarchs, Rudradeva, Bhojadeva and Lakshmi-kamadeva in the year 135 N. S. (=1014 A. D.)[7] It appears that the period before N S 128 back to Raghavadeva cannot be filled up as such by MSS for lack of them. But we have a statement of V" which says that Raghava and his successors ruled for 135 years. Kirkpatrick's authority allots 134 years to the

1 JBORS, 1936, iii, p 166 ff.

2 This I have discussed in my 'Early History of Nepal'.

3 See Kirkpatrick. p 262.

4 The MS. *Lankavatara* is dated S 28 but there is no mention of contemporary ruler (Cat. 140).

5 Catalogue of Buddhist MSS. in Cambridge Library, p 4.

6 *Nirbhayadeva Rudradevasya Vijayarajya.*

7 CSBM, pp 151 52, MS, No. 1643.

same, so that he too may be declared to have agreed[1]. On the basis of his date the V' has fixed the number of years at no less and no more than 128 years,[2] which on the authority of MSS is found to be absolutely correct. I have given the following data to show for each the approximate regnal years.

Raghavadeva	...	879	A. D.
Jayadeva	...	46	years
Vikramadeva	...	8	years 9 months
Narendradeva	...	1	year 5 months
Ganakamadeva	...	65	years 5 months
		(Mistaken by Kirpatrick and put 85)	
Udayadeva	...	5	years 5 months[3]
		128	

According to Buddhist chronicles who omit Raghavadeva and Udayadeva, Baladeva ruled for 13 years, Jayadeva for 15 years, Balarjunadeva for 12 years, Vikramadeva for 12 years and Gunakamadeva for 51 years. The total, however, is only 103 years. If we add Shankaradeva and Vardhamana the lotal becomes exactly 128 years. As Shankaradeva occurs in Kirkpatrick's chronology as the immediate successor of Raghavadeva, he may be taken in the new list. But it is impossible to accept Varadeva as the same person as Raghavadeva. Perhaps his name must be taken as dropped out without trying further for untenable identification[4].

As to who was Raghava's immediate predecessor there is some speculation. The various lists have displayed a great variance in this respect. Bendal's list does not mention him, as its starting point is the year 879 A. D. According to Kirkpatrick, Balarjunadeva is the father of Raghavadeva[5]. Whatever may be his relation with the latter, he

1 Kirkpatrick, p 262.

2 Bendal's Table in JASB, op. cit.

3 See Bendal's list in his Journey to Nepal.

4 Wright, pp 133-39 ; I A., XIII, pp 411-12; Levi, II, p 184.

5 Kirkpatrick, op. cit, p. 262.
Shankaradeva built Sankhu, a town on the north-eastern corner of the valley. The goddess *ugratara* dwells in the hill above the town. Gunakamadeva built Kantipur, modern Kathmandu, at the confluence of the two rivulets, Bagmati and Bishnumati,

must be No. I Balarjunadeva. If he is Raghava's father, then the line of the Lichhavis must end long before 879 A.)D. Kirkpatrick has introduced five princes in between Jayadeva II and Raghavadeva with a total reign of 121 years. Thus Jayadeva II's reign would be pushed back beyond C 758 A. D. But that is the date of his Insription (No. 15)[1]. The correct result, however, would be obtained by striking off the duplicate name of Jayadeva coming third after him and distributing the 42 years between Raghava and Jayadeva II. Kirkpatrick's authority does not seem so wide of the mark if the list is thus arranged[2].

In the line of Raghavadeva Gunakamadeva is given a prominent place by the *Vansabali*[3]. He is the founder of Kantipur[4]. The date is wrongly given nearly two hundred years before, *i. e.*, in Kalijuga 3824 [724 A. D.] Levi (11, p 185) infers from the founding of the towns in this period that a particular stage of progress was visible in the economic life of the people. As noted in the T'ang history (i, p 164) the populace was gradually being adopted to follow commercial profession and manual arts, like painting, modelling, etc. The last were preserved as late as the 18th century[5].

Main Outline of Events and Chronology.

The line of Raghavadava ended with Jayadeva[6] according to Bendal. Wright's and Indraji's authorities also take the line to have ended with him, *i. e.* with Jayakamadeva whose predecessor's dated MS we have already cited. (श्रब्दे शते षड्कविंशतिगते). Though Kirkpatrick's authority has mentioned the following line in the same continuity, the other chronicles have been found to have agreed on this point. The joint regime probably ended in 1039 A. D. for in that year Laksmi-Kamadeva

1 See Indian Antiquary, Vol. IX, p 178 ; GI, p 186-87.

2 Nandadeva of this line is, according to some (Wright) the founder of the Salivahana Era in Nepal. According to Jayaswal (P 249) who gives Thakuri paternity to Jayadeva II the Chronology stands as follows : –Shivadeva II, Jay II, Chandra Kaladeva II, Narendradeva II, Varadeve, Raghavadeva.

3 Wright, p 154 ; Levi, ii. p 185.

4 Kantipur is the old name of the town of Kathmandu, Patan was then the capital. Most of the present towns and cities owe their origin to this period.

5 *Vide* below.

6 He is known also as Vijayadeva (Bhagwan Lal). His Predecessor Lakshmi Kamadeva ruled as a sole King before him (MS 168, 1683, dates 159).

is shown to have ruled singly (cf Ms. Addl. 2191. सद्धर्म पुण्डरिका)[1] Jayadeva has no MSS. probably because he ruled only for a short time and that also only in Lalita Patan according to V[1], which led him to be entirely missed and disowned by the chroniclers[2]. The Tibetans had passed through Nepal in 1038 A. D. to fetch Dipankar Sri *alias* Atisha of Vikramshila.

From a statement in the chronicles of Wright and Bhagwan Lal, we have a new line of the Nawakot Thakuri in the scene[3]. Levi's authority is of opinion that the founder of this line, Bhaskaradeva, was formerly a Governor in Patan[4]. He refused to pay homage to the King. The Manuj Sri-Multantra's statement depicts a scene of disorder (Levi, i, p 64) and a feudal anarchy in the country, which taken literally would mean the state Jayadeva found himself in. The fact that he was a ruler in Deb Patan[3] suggests also the correctness of the statement that he was not obeyed in other districts. The King seems to have afterwards retired to a private life in Palpa. Taranath tells us that Atisha met only a local ruler in the valley in 1040 A. D. and the sovereign having resided at Palpa in the west he had proceeded thither[5]. His name is given as Ananta Kirti [Grags-pa-mtha-yas]. As we have a MS. of the next reign *i. e.* of Bhaskaradeva dated Ns 167 [1046 A. D.], there is no doubt that he was not meant for *Ananta Kirti*. There is no identity between the two names, Ananta Kirti and Jayadeva, as apparently considered. But Ananta Kirti's existence may be established by the discovery of his identity with *Yasonath*, the father of Vanadeva (Bendal, Ins. V.)[6]. M. Levi considers Yasonath not in any way related to the throne in Nepal[7]. Bhunath according to him does not signify kingship. But Bendal and others identifying Banadeva with Bamadeva of Ns 204

1 CBMC, P 172.

2 Bendal table, JASB., 1903, Part I, p 22.

3 Kikpatrick, p 263 ; Levi, II, p 193.

4 Wright, p 161; I A, XIII, p 413.

5 Life of Atisha, translated by Sarat Chandra Das in Journal of the Buddhist Text Society, I, pp 25-30 ; Levi , i, p 167.

6 Bendal, Journey, p 79; CPMDN, (Intro.) p 6. The notices in J. Buddh T. S. Ind, Vol, I, p 27.

7 Levi, ii, p 196.

accept Yasonath as the King of Nepal. We will consider the latter factor on particular occasions, but one thing will have to be borne in mind while considering the history of this period and that is the view of the *Vamsabalis* as regards the origin of a new line under Vamadeva. The chronology of this prince is a matter of difficult enumeration, while the inscription is a proof of his existence, he is not noted in the *chronicles*[1]. It is, however, likely that Yasonath might havebeen a de jure ruler, whom Atisha met in Palpa. Though the *chronicles* have taken a unanimous stand in noting Jayadeva as having no legal successor, we may take him to have a brother Yasonath who had to remain on exile in Palpa when the Governor of Kantipur uprooted the dynasty of his brother. This fact also coincides with the evidence of Palpa genealogy that there was no king of his name in the list given by Bhavadutta[2]. Vamadeva's succession later on was a restoration of the old dynasty.

Towards 1040 A. D. Nepal as already hinted was visited by Atisha who had responded to the desire of the King of Tibet, Lha jama Jnana Sri, that he should preach in his domain[3]. Atisha is credited to have introduced novel features in Mahayana form of Buddhism and it is not unlikely that his presence in Nepal would have influenced the type prevailing there. Perhaps the Tantric form of Mahayana dates from his visit, to which the Lamaism he founded in Tibet further added greater lustre and revolutionary changes in matters of worship. And Nepal then had become the channel through which the Pala Kings propagated their Vajrayana doctrines[4]. Atisha's visit in the valley is probably noted under the mythical story of Matsyendranath, a Vajrayana teacher of that century[5].

As earlier referred to Bhaskaradeva is the founder of the New Thakur idynasty. It is said that he obtained power after being elected by the people to fill up the vacancy caused by the death without

1 They have noted only Vamadeva,

2 See Historical Records Commission Report, XIII, p 62.

3 Levi, II, p 194, Taranath, *ibid*, p 253-55.

4 History of Indian and Indonesian Art by A. Coomaraswamy, p. 144.

5 Wright, p 151. The account mentions that Arya Avalokiteswara, the third Buddha, took the shape of a fish. Wright's authority wrongly puts him back during Narendradeva's reign.

any issue of the last King of the preceding dynasty of rulers. About his reignal date we have a Ms. *Vishnudharma* dated Nepala Samvat 167 corresponding to the year 879+167=1046 A. D. Previously the date of this Ms. was wrongly rendered in terms of the era obtaining before the Nepala Samvat, as it was generally taken to have been written in later Guptan Script. But Bendal has corrected this rendering from some other authoritative sources[1]. In this Ms. Bhaskaradeva is given the title of *Parame Bhattaraka Maharaja Dhiraj* (परम भट्टारक महा-राजाधिराज)[2] Probably intended to denote his sovereignty over the whole country[3]. According to V' he ruled for three years, so that if the first date of the succeeding reign be taken to be NS 180 *Ms. Nishwasakhya Mahatantra* निश्वसाख्य[4] the ten years' gap between S 170 and S180 remains unfilled up. We may, however, accept the latter reign to have begun earlier in S 170 with the result that the twelve years period as attested by VI tally with this enumeration. The next reign which according to another *Ms. Saddharmapundarika* सद्धर्म पुण्डरीक placed sometime in S185 must have commenced from the year S184 and here also the last date of this reign can be taken to S186 (Camb. Addle 1864 & 2197.)

Thus we come to the reign of Shankara Deva[6] who ruled for 15 years probably from S186 to S200 the first date of the exile Vamadeva as it comes from the Ms. *Seka Nirdeshapanjika* (सेक निर्देश पञ्जिका[7]) Vamadeva seems to have been restored to powers at a later date in supercession of the Nwakot Thakuri line. About Shankaradeva's date we have three MSS[8], Dharmapatrika S 189 (धर्म पत्रिका) *Astasahashrika*

1 JBAS, i, H. P. Shastri, No. 1002. P312.

2 CPMDN. Intro. P 29-30.

3 Bhagwanlal IA,iii, P414.
Wright, P 157
Levi, ii, PP 193-94.

4 C P M D N, Intro P 11

5 CPMDN, Intro. PP6, 30

6 Rai says that between Bhaskaradeva and Balarjunadeva there must be another ruler. According to another source Pradyumnakamadeva and Nagarjunadeva were joint rulers.
Levi, ii, P194

7 St Petersburg Collection. S200 JRAS, 1891, P 687

8 CPMDN, PP 92, 196; Levi, ii, 195.

S 191 (अष्टसाहस्रिका) and *Tika Bodhicharyavatara* S 198. He was the last ruler of the Nwakot Thakuri dynasty.

Vamadeva had a reign of three years. It is not yet settled whether this monarch is the same Vamadeva of Ins. V of Bendal, though the dates in both, if the inscription were to be referred to the Nepal Era, tally wonderfully well[1]. Levi takes these two names as having absolutely no connections. Vamadeva might have been another personage and probably a Governor of Patan, as Levi also conjectures, as the latter was not adopting royal titles,[2] for Vamadeva we have a dated inscription of S203, which however, Levi does not ascribe to him. It is generally believed that Vamadeva belonged to Amshuvarman's line, and thus he was regarded as the rightful heir to the throne by the many chiefs of the land. After his restoration the Nwakot branch of the Thakuris was exiled to the western hills. There is a Ms. *Kubji kamatam*[3] a tantric Mahayana work now preserved in the Nepal Library which gives besides other things the following in the Colophon *Parameswara Paramabhattaraka Maharajadhiraja Srimad Ramapala Devasya Vijayarajya.* (H. P. Sastri, Cat. P54). From this certain Scholars have inferred that the Palas more particularly Ramapala (1084—1130 A. D.) must have ruled over Nepal, but other evidences of his occupation are lacking.

Vamadeva's successor was Harsadeva who ruled for fourteen years between NS 204 and 219[4]. The last Ms. of his reign is dated 219 (current) and perhaps this was the date of his death. Taking advantage of the Nanyadeva situation as it emerged after his death Karnataka seems to have invaded Nepal and conquered the country.

Nanyadeva's Invasion.

Nanyadeva's conquest is altogether omitted by Bendal's chronology, while Wright's and Bhagwanlal's authorities push him to a later date

1 Finding that the scripts in this inscription were of the same nature as those of the Palm leaf Ms. (Camb. Addl. 1864, Cat. P XXV, 173) Bendal was led to stick to that identification.

2 Bendal, Journey, P79

3 Levi, ii, PP 196-99

4 Harsa's Mss dated NS 210, 213, 219-Nos. 1670, 1000, 2197 respectively, Cambridge Cat CPMDN, p 2; JABS, 1897, Ibid, P312.

towards the reign of the last King of Vamadeva's dynasty second time restored. As we have already observed, this mistake was due to the tendency of the chroniclers to copy names one after the other notwithstanding their contemporaneity so that each name thus arranged looked as coming in succession and two contemporary dynasties were presented similarly to have ruled with the consequence that all of them were wrongly dated. Nanyadeva seems to have seized the opportunity of advancement provided by the disintegration of Kanauj after the death of Chandradeva and subsequent defeat of Karna of Chedi. His initial date for Nepal has been believed by the majority of scholars to fall sometime in 1097 A. D. on the basis of a record occurring in Vidyapati's Purusapariksha (P 19 Darbhanga Edition) the expression being *Nandendu Vidyu Sammita Shakavarsha* (सम्मित शाक वर्षे) The forefathers of Nanyadeva could carve out a principality of their own and advance towards the Himalayas in course of a military expedition conducted by Kalachuri Bijjala and by Yadava Jaitugi. At the time this expedition reached Mithila, it was occupied by Gangeyadeva Haihaya who ruled there for some time since 1019 A. D. as verified by a MS. in the Nepal Library[2]. Nanyadeva probably operated against Nepal from the bases he obtained in Mithila,[3] and he must have inherited the kingdom of Mithila from his father.

Nanyadeva did not have a peaceful time in Nepal while he could not subjugate the entire valley, we find that one of the two independent dynasties of rulers in the valley was functioning intact throughout the period of occupation, he was at the same time not permitted to enjoy an undisturbed and regular occupation even of one place. His was one of the most disturbed period. Towards the end of 1118 A. D. again his position became very weak in Mithila owing to the rise of the Sena Dynasty in Bengal, whose representative a little later defeated him in a

---

1 An inscription mentions Nepal at Elur EI, V, 149 ; ibid, p 29

2 Levi, ii, p. 202, pl ; EP. In II 9, 11 ; Rapson, Indian Coins, p. 33 ; V. A. Smith, JASB, LXVII P 306 ; Bendal, Op. Cit, p 18

3 On the origin of Nanyadeva and Senas of Bengal read EI, i, p. 305 ; JASB, v. 1909, p 407 ; ibid, 1915, p 411 ; R. D. Banerji, Benglar Itihas, Vol. i, p 318 ; H. C. Rai op. cit, Pt ii, p 358 ; JBORS, ix, p 302 ; IA, ix, p 188 ; xiii, p 418 (Bhagwanlal). Nanya is a Karnataka word in Nepal and Naniya or Nani an expression of endearment is a derivative of the same.

battle (Deopara Inscription of Vijaya Sena, verses 20&21) and this seems to have sent its repercussions in Nepal and affected his security[1]. It seems that the Thakuri scion made a bold attempt to regain his throne and also succeeded for some time in being restored to the throne of his ancestors. He adopted a very high sounding royal title of the *Raja dhiraja Parmeswara* (राजाधिराज परमेश्वर). Wc have a MS of the year 1120 A. D. (Indian Office, Hodgson Collection, 73 A), which says that Shivadeva, son and successor of Shankaradeva, had led the uprising[2]. Shivadeva, is given a total reign of 27 years by the Chroniclers but his dated MSS cover an unbroken period of only five years from NS 239 to NS 244. It seems that the chroniclers in an attempt to hide the facts of Nanyadeva's invasion enumerated his reign from the date of the death of the last reign. For the interval between 1123 A. D. and Nanyadeva's reconquest of the valley we have according to V' Indradeva, son and successor of Shivadeva, who also adopted the title of *Rajadhiraja* (राजाधिराज)[3] and thereafter Manadeva who ruled jointly with his son Narendradeva and singly without him till 1141 A.D. Manadeva[4] probably retained his royal title even after his retirement, as the date of the Ms *Panchraksha* (पञ्चरक्षा) shows[5].

About Nanyadeva's conquest of the valley we have many other records besides those of the chronology. The inscription of Pratapa Malla, which traces his origin to Nanyadeva, though not mentioning in exact terms about his conquest of Nepal, gives an idea of the episode by way of inference, only the duration of his regime is subject to doubt if doubt could ever be entertained.

In the year 1141 A.D. Nanyadeva again occupied the valley, but this time also as before occupation was not of a long duration. A few

---

1 IA, i, pp 309, 313 ; JBORS, XXV, m-iv, p 132.

2 On Shivadeva the chronicle confers the title of 'the great conqueror', probably it was referring to his military gains over Nanyadeva. Another chronicle mentions Nanyadeva to have conquered also Bhatgaon, according to Bhagwan Lal, IA, XIII, 417, Wright p 167. Nanya must have retained Bhatgaon in his hand only for a short while.

3 Ms. Jataka 249, India Office.

4 CPMDN, P62.

5 Bhagwanlaland Wright's authorities write that Narendra Deva was regent of Manadeva. Possibly this was implied by certain overlapping (Levi, ii, p 207) Of dates and names.

years later his base kingdom in Mithila was threatened from Kanauj and it proved too much for him to resist. Nanya lost his dominion in Nepal as well in consequence thereof, and as early as 1147 A. D. the Thakuri king appears to have been ruling independent of any outside pressure. From some 5 MSS, dated NS 275, 278, 284, 285, 286, it is clear that the Thakuri king throwing off the yoke of Karnataka rule was no other than Anandadeva, and he had a reign period extending to 1170 A.D. or so, as the last MS indicates[1]. He was succeeded by Rudradeva who ruled till 1176 A. D. There is, however, no evidence in writing about him.

It seems that Nanyadeva's dynasty with the exception of the founder was not in possession of the Nepal throne until 1314 A.D. As soon as Nanyadeva's powerful hands were withdrawn, the scion of the Thakuri dynasty re-established and began to rule from Kathmandu. This is best expressed through one factor, that of absence of MSS in one case and their abundance in another. For example we have no MSS in the name of Nanyadeva's successors between 1117 A.D. and 1314 A,D. while there are numerous of them to the credit of the Thakuri rulers of the same period.

Bendal's chronology depicts a scene of tense situation during Rudradeva's reign. Nepal was striken with a great calamity, and famine and war stalked the land and the people suffered extremely on that account. The chronicle further says that the price of grain was high, food was improcurable and everywhere plunder and depredation made existence risky and miserable. Rudradeva was surely too much forgotten in that panic to be taken note of.

Amritadeva succeeded Rudradeva. The *Ms. Dashakarmapaddhati* (दश कर्म पद्धति) copied in his reign in S 296 (1176 A. D.) may be taken to have presented that year to be his initial regnal year. After three years of rule he was succeeded by Ratnadeva, whose name is omitted by all the chronicles, but he is identified by a MS[2] of the Kathmandu Library, dated NS 303. His successor Someshwaradeva whose name had led many scholars to infer the conquest of Nepal by a Chalukya

1 Bendal, Journey ; CPMDN, Intro. p 23.

2 CPMIN, P 65. Intro P23. Levi reads the name as Rudradeva, ii, P 203.

prince of his name[1] was the son of Indradeva according to V' . We have no Ms. data for his reign, nor there is any other proof of his invasion from the south except one Chalukya prince's claim to have conquered it,[2] which of course can be discarded as a boastful claim of a monarch shorn of all reality.

The next ruler is Gunakamodeva who ruled for a few years in or about Ns. 307 according to *Ms. Jayakhyadeva Samhita* (जयाख्यदेव संहिता)[3]. Bendal's chronology V' attributes to him a reign period of four years, but about his successor Lakshmi Kamadeva following him in S 313 (Ms. British Museum, 2279) no reign period is given. The next ruler is Vijayakamadeva. Two Mss. dated NS 316 & 317 (British Museum 3345) are available for his reign[4]. According to V' he ruled for 17 years, but this cannot be verified by the first dated Ms of the next reign coming in S 322 = 1201 A. D. He might have ruled for only five years.

The chronology of Wright and Bhagwanlal introduce at this stage the Malla dynasty of rulers in the history of Nepal. They were previously mentioned very briefly in connection with a tax called *mallakara* मल्लकार and Manadeva's victory over them. It is not known how they migrated to the valley of the seven Gandaks and least of all to the Nepal valley. They might have taken advantage of the disturbed situation of the thirteenth century A. D and anything more than that about the new dynasty cannot be guessed[5].

The Mallas.

The Mallas had their own territory in Kushinagar. They were a republican people. But this republic could not survive the fate of destruction that was meted out to them as soon as the Mauryas found their Empire. It is much probable that they repaired to the region in the hills along the bank of the R. Gandak and settled down there in view of the proximity of Kushinagar to that part of Nepal. It also seems

1 Levi, ii, Rai, ii; P209
2 JBORS, XI, P268.
3 CPMDN, P76
4 CPMDN, P76, Intro, PP24, 113.
5 Levi, ii, pp 67, 102, 201

that the Mallas followed commercial profession as is evident from the tax, *mallakara*, which was surely a tax on professions. They continued to live in that condition for a long time. The chronicle speaks of a Malla family ruling in Tirhut before and after Nanyadeva. While we have no authentic evidence to rely on the assertion of the chronicles, the existence of such a dynasty in a part of Tirhut or Mithilla appears not wholly impossible[1]. The Mallas might have been prompted by sheer chance to infiltrate into Nepal when they found the country steeped in turmoil and disorder. The vast resources they had at their disposal probably enabled them to undertake a military venture of the type wanted for the invasion or a, palace coup d'etat.

At present there are two types of Mallas, both of them claiming Rajput lineage. The two are differentiated under circumstances of their habitation, the type in the hills and the valley—the latter now being identified with Newari culture except that they follow the Shaiva cult in common with the clan of the hills. The Malla of the hills calls himself a Thakuri and has marriage relation with other Ksatriyas of the country as distinct from the Newar Malla who is now absolutely disowned by other Kshatriya new comers, though he also claims his Aryan origin.

When we talk of the Malla dynasty of Nepal rulers, we mean not those who inhabit the hill areas. As to the identification of the Newar Mallas with the historical Mallas, there seems to be little doubt, and again as they reveal a feature definitely non-Newari, we may accept their comparatively recent adoption in the Newari community. M. Levi, however, says that the Malla appendage does only signify the fact of the founder being a wrestler, and he, agreeing with Bhagwanlal also dismisses the contention that a new dynasty had come to power with Arideva Malla who began a new line (Levi, ii, p213).

Two ancestors of the Mallas have been traced from a *ms. Devi mahatmya* dated NS 298 and Nilgriba pillar inscription respectively[2]. These are Dharamalla and Rupamalla. What relationship they bear to Arideva is not known. The latter dates his inscription in Vikram Samvat

1 Levi, ii, pp 210-13.
2 Archaeological Report of Terai Excavation by P.C. Mukerji, 1901, Report, pp 634.

1234. For Arimalla we have three dated Mss, dated Ns 322, 326 and 336[1]. The next ruler was Ranashura Malla whose *Ms Vidyapati* विद्यापति[2] styling him *Puramabhattaraka maharajadhiraj* is dated NS 342=1221 A.D. This prince, however, is denied existence by all the chronicles. It may be that he was a usurper chieftain. He should not be mistaken for his name sake of Bendal ruling in 1021-25A.D. Abhayamalla who was a legal successor of Arimalla, according to Wright's and Bhagwanlal's authorities he is the founder of the line, comes immediately after in NS 344=1223 A.D. as the MS. *Bharatiya Natyashastra* (भारतीय नाटय शास्त्र) indicates. He had a long reign of about thirty years aocording to the dates in the colophons of the MSS. *Devi Mahatwya* S 358, *Astasahasrikaprajnap aramit* S.367, *Panchrakasha* S3731[3]. Abhayamalla was a patron of arts and learning, and encouraged the same and during his reign cultural missions were sent to Tibet and China, of one such missions the Yvan annal has spoken in high terms of praise (See, Ante chapter on art and architecture). His time, however, was disturbed by visitation of famines and earthquakes[4]. His son Jayadeva Malla ruled for two years according to the chronicle which is confirmed by a MS coming in at the interval of two years, the last probably was copied in his last year S 377[5]. He seems to have voluntarily retired in favour of his successor, Jayabhimadeva, whom the chronicle assigns a reign of thirteen years. He has only a dated MS. of S 386, but as the first Ms of the next reign dates S399, the assertion of the chronicle may be taken as correct but the reign of Jayasaha Malla whose MS does not exist in spite of his name occurring in the list of the chronicle will have to be struck off[6]. It is also possible that he was a Regent without enjoying dejure powers.

Ananta Malla, son of Rajadeva, was the next ruler[7]. According to Levi's authority (ii, p35) he is a brother of Jayadeva Malla. He had a

1 CPMDN, PP83, 95-96 : CBMC, PP154-55.
2 CSMBM, PP212-14.
3 CPMDN, P69 ; ibid, Intro. PP24-25 ; CSMBN, pp226-27.
4 Levi, ii, p214.
5 CPMDN, P25.
6 H. C. Rai is of the opinion that he was only a Crown Prince.
7 These above quoted five names are omitted by Wright and Bhagwanlal.

reign of twenty eight years from S399 to S 427. We have five MSS of his reign[1] —*Mahala Khsmibratam S 399. Ekadashibrata mahatmya S403, Laxmyallatra Stotra S 403, Sarabali by Kalyanvarman S400, Anantabrata bidhi S 405, Ksemendra's Bodhisatwabodhana S422.* Anantamalla's reign takes us to the year 1307 A. D. His successor Jayanandadeva whose MS. *Naganada*[2] is dated S 438 had a reign period of ten years. The chronicle records that it was a period of anarchy and there was no central administration, every chieftain called himself a king and tried to further his own petty interests[3] and all temples were sacrileged. The Nepal valley was also occasionally disturbed by invasion from the West and north by the Khasias and Magars. One Aditmal called Sena entered into the valley at the head of an invading force and occupied a portion of it for sometime. He was followed by Makunda Sena of Palpa[4]. Although both these invaders were compelled to retreat on account of the widespread pestilence and disease then raging high, the country they left was completely devastated and ruined. But worse than these, Nepal faced the rise of another serious invasion from the south led by Harisinhadeva of Tirhut, who was but taking advantage of the calamity striking Nepal at the time.

The exiled Thakuris also seem to have been raising their head at this time, and actually one prince got himself restored to power.

Invasion from Tirhut.

The conquest of the valley of Kathmandu by Harisinhadeva took place in 1314 A. D. The episode is the subject of a drama by Chandreswara in his Krityaratnakara and therein Harisinhadeva has been mentioned to have performed a sacrificial ceremony on the bank of the R. Bagmati[5]. The chronicles of Wright and Bhagwanlal put 1324 A. D. as the first date of occupation of the Nepal valley by Harisinhadeva. But he could not retain his conquest for long. After sometime he found that

1 Cat, P46 : ibid, PP44 73 ; CSMBM, P 82.

2 CPMDN, P 73.

3 Wright, pp; 167·77.

4 Kirkpatrick, P 256. V''' wrongly puts Additmal's invasion to the year 1328 A. D.

5 JASB, 1915, P 410.

the Malla rulers were putting up a stiff resistance and his original kingdom of Tirhut itself threatened by the rise of the Tughlaks. This compelled him to leave Nepal, and this is expressed by a MS dated 1318 A. D., which shows in the colophon a Thakuri prince as a ruler. Harisinha's attention was always diverted even when he was in possession of the valley. But when Muhammad Tuglak forced him to retire to the hills after defeating him in 1324 A. D,[1] he devoted himself solely to consolidate his position there. Also in 1324 A. D. the last independent kingdom of Hindu India was effaced out of the map.

Harisinhadeva entered Nepal again in 1324 A. D.[2] and ruled comparatively for a long time, may be from Bhatgaon where the temple of Tulajadevi is attributed to him by legends. According to chronicles Thakuri Jayarajadeva was ruling in Kathmandu in 1346 A. D.[3] This means that the Thakuri dynasty was totally eclipsed for that interval, Harisinhadeva's invasion is not noted in the Nepalese chronicle of Iayasthitis time[4] It was probably because the contemporary chroniclers regarded him as an alien invading the country. During Harisinhadeva's reign Nepal also received a number of MS works from Mithila as a result of the local scholars taking refuge in the valley for fear of being molested by the Muhammadan invaders. Since his time also we have a number of Maithil Brahmans in the Nepal valley.

Muslim Invasion

In about the year 1347 A. D, wc find the valley divided into two independent principaliti es for sometime ; while Harisinha's successors counted their days at Bhatgaon in the eastern portion of the valley, his antagonists of the Thakuri dynasty had emerged victorious in the west and ruled from Kathmandu. They functioned as fully independent rulers, and owed not even nominal allegiance to the former. Both these were united towards the end of the century by a Malla prince.

1 JBORS, XXII. Pt II. P86. For the conquest of Tirhut by the Tuglaks, read Tarikhi Firishta, translated by Briggs, i, p 406 and Tabarikat-i-Nasiri, translated by Raverty, p 830. The leader of the expedition was Sultan Izzuddin Tughril.

2 Levi, ii, P220; JASB, 1915, pp411-12.

3 JASB, LXII, p 250. Bendal, JASB, 1903, p 12; JBORS, 1936, p 615.

4 Bendal disbelieves the story of invasion altogether.

Before the unification took place Nepal was again disturbed by events of invasions from the south. The western portion of the valley was particularly rocked by a Muslim invasion. It happened in the reign of Jayarajadeva successor of Jayanandadeva whose paternity is not established. Probably he was a descendant of Vamadevite Thakuri. The Swayambhunath inscription[1] mentions clearly the invasion to have occurred in his reign (*Jayarajadeva nripati tenaiba rajyam Krite*). We have a *Ms Vamakeswari matatippana* of Jayarajadeva's reign[2]. A reference in H. P. Shastri's catalogue (i, x, p 19) ascribes his accession to power to the intrigue organised by a woman Regent Devaladevi, who again according to V''' made Sri Pashupatimalla Deva (Nep. Cat., i, Pl. 8) a prisoner. The later account speaks of Jayarajadeva to have ascended the throne with the unanimous consent of the courtiers, and of both the houses of rulers. Devaladevi was probably a daughter of Pashupatimalladeva and married to Jayarajadeva but nothing is known about the paternity or genealogy of Pashupatimalla.

Harisinha's ancestry is traced to Nanyadeva. According to Pratapamalla's inscription the list stands from father to son in the following order:—

Nanayandeva
Gangadeva
Ramasinha.
Shaktisinha.
Bhupalsinha.
Harisinhadeva.

Harisinhadeva was the last independent ruler of Tirhut. But the Mithila chronicles do not trace his origin to Nanyadeva, though Chandeshwar calls him to have been born of Karnataka dynasty.

From an inscription recently discovered at Swayambhunath it appears that Sultan Shamsuddin Illyas of Bengal, invaded Nepal by taking advantage of its weak position. The route he traversed to reach the val-

1 An inscribed slab on a wall between two rows of houses of a lane to the west of Tibetan Vihara just in front of the great stupa.

2 CPMDN, P71, As. Soc. Bn. Coll. of 1893, Intro, P.27.

ley is still a matter of speculation. It was not certainly through Tirhut as this country was independent of Bengal till 1352 A. D.[1] According to Jasyaswal, Firoz Shah Tughlak had set up another family of rulers called Oinwars and they acknowledged his suzerainty and there was a feeling of rivalry between Delhi and Bengal Sultanates. Sultan Shamsuddin must have entered through the present Purnia district and travelling due west must have taken the route of the R. Bagmati. Sultan Shamsuddin's attack on Nepal is omitted by all the chronicles except that of Bendal[2]. There is also no reference in the contemporary Indian records to this episode.

In the *Hamirmahakavya* Allaudin Khilji also is noted to have exacted tribute from the King of Nepal at about the same time[3]. But this seems to be a far fetched surmise. As we know even Tirhut was outside the sphere of Khilji influence, and therefore, the poet's claim on Nepal cannot hold ground. A coin struck in Nepal in the name of Allauddin Muhammed Shah Khilzi (?) has *Sri Sripati, etc*, in the middle circle (ob) and it is held by some historians that the Nepalese ruler of the time owed allegiance to the Khilzi rulers[4].This coin is further brought as an evidence supporting the contention of the Hamirkavya but as the name Sri Sri pati is not verified from evidences of local sources, this can be best set aside or probably *Sripati* was a ruler at Palpa, and its nearness to the Oudh regions must have determined the subsidiary character of his status. Shamsuddin's invasion of Nepal was, however, a fact. Due to the silence of the chornicles a belief had gained ground that Nepal was practically untouched by Muslims in any period of its history. For a long time this belief gained currency also in view of the inscription at Swayambhunath not being discovered. It was curious that Bendal gives an impression of a plate of his chronicle V''' (Nepal catalogue, i. plate 8)[5] which deals with the fact of Muslim invasion but he does not attend to note the contents. In 1936, however, K. P. Jayaswal correctly read the

1 In that year Sultan Shams uddin himself invaded but had to relinquish his hold on pressure by Tughlaks (Camb. Hist. of India, iii, PP 175-263).

2 JBORS,1936 pt ii, Read Jayaswal's article.

3 IA, viii, P68.

4 Numismatic supplement, 1929, p 37.

5 Thi hronclsogy owas written in the time of Jayasthitimalla,

plate as well as recovered and read the inscription[1] and also got the facts mentioned therein verified by Bendal's own find of the chronicle V''', which gives an account of the reconstruction work taking place after the invasion. Thus the fact of the Muslim invasion of Nepal was fully established.

The records speak of Shamsuddin to have besieged Kathmandu for sometime, burnt and plundered the town and sacrileged and demolished images and temples including those of Pashupatinath. A few remains of the broken images are attributed to this orgy of mass demolition and incendiarism.

The inscription is dated NS 492=1271-72. This was set up to inaugurate the restoration ceremony of the Stupa (*Dharmadhatumandap*) that was severely damaged by *Suratrana* (*Sultan*) *Samasdina* (Shamsuddin) of Bengal, who invaded Nepal at the head of a huge force (*bahulairbaliah*) in the month of Margasirsha (November-December) in NS 467=1346 A. D. The donor is one Raja Harsa Bhalloka, son of Minister Ranashaktimalla Bhalloka and the reign in which the ceremony was performed was that of Jayarjunadeva, son of Jayarajadeva who died having been burnt while asleep and at whose time the invasion took place. Along with the reigning monarch the inscription mentions Jayasthitimalla as the country's protector (*Palite Jayasthimallena ratnakarenduna*). According to this inscription Jayarjuna succeeded Jayarajadeva.

Bendal's choronicle V''' gives NS167 as the initial year of Jayarajadeva's reign, and speaking about the year NS 469 it adds that the treasury of Pashupatinath was opened and used to meet the expense of the work of reconstruction after the widespread ruination the country sustained as a result of invasion a little earlier by Sultan Shamsuddin (*Suratrana Samasdina*). According to the chronicle Pashupatinath's image was throughly broken and entire Nepal was reduced to ashes (*Pashupati trikhandi Kritan*, *Nepala Samastabhasmi Kritam*) and there was national mourning. The treasury of Pashupatinath was twice opened and for the second time by Devaladevi. It is a common practice in Nepal to utilise funds out of Pashupatinath's treasury at every time of national crisis.

1 An impression of this inscription was lying in the Durbar Library since a long time to which Jayaswal's attention was fortunately drawn leadihg him to trace out the original.

The inscription does not give details of invasion. So the duration of the seize is only an inference. Jayaswal's description of the invading forces to have operated from a base at the foot of the Swayambhu hillock is equally no better than a guess work. About the identity of the invader, however, there is little doubt because the inscription clearly mentions Bengal, and that from the contemporry history of the same country it can also be obtained that Shamsuddin Iliyas was ruling in that period (1342-57 A. D.) independent of the Tughlaks. It is also possible that he was ultimately forced to leave Nepal after a crushing defeat, and this fact of forced retreat back to his own country might have led the chroniclers of his court to omit all references to his Nepal adventure.

According to Levi's authority (ii, P286) Jayarajadeva, who in the words of a MS (Nep. Cat. Bendal, Intro. P 27) was alive in NS 476=1355 A. D., died without a male heir, and was succeeded by a daughter Nayakadevi who reigned with her grandmother Padmalladevi as the Regent. The chronicle further says that Nayakadevi was married to Raja Harischandradeva of Banaras, who was later on poisoned, and her person was also captured by Jagatsinha of Tirhut and Harischandra's own brother Gopaladeva. By Tirhut the chronicle might have referred to the Bhatgaon stock of Harisinhadeva then too suppressed to show off any mettle.

But this was disproved by Bendal's V''' and Swayambhunath inscription and they bring in Jayarjunadeva as the son and successor of Jayarajadeva who died of a fire accident.

About Jayarjunadeva whose MSS were available for the period between 1363 and 1371 A. D. there was a dispute as to his origin and status. Dr. Jayaswal's research has, however, established his descent from Jayarajadeva. The Swayambhunath inscription and V''' have clearly laid down that he was the son of Jayarajadeva and Rudramadevi[1]. He has assumed on himself the title of Rajadhiraja in MS *Meghaduta*, dated 1363 A. D.[2], but this title was then adopted even by monarchs of dependent status. Anyway there is one more proof of his independent

1 KPJ, JBORS, XXII, Pt ii, P88; Bendal's Cat, i, Pl 8.

2 CPMDN, P31.

status, and that is the coins in his name, which are a new feature of evidence for that period (species 1364 and 1381, Journey by Bendal, table). We do not have coins for the period since the eighth century A. D. With the installation of Jayarjundeva the Thakuris whom the chronicles earlier called Sooryavamsis seem to have once again broken from the tutelage of Harishinhadeva's[1] descendants.

Jayarjuna, however, was not allowed to have a normal course of rule. A coup d' etat led by Jayasthithimalla, the husband of Rajalladevi[2] who in her turn took up the cause of the Kanataka Prince brought about his downfall, but his line was not wholly ended. From Levi we get the information that Nayakadevi was remarried to Jagatsinha and their child was Rajalla. It is possible that Jagatsinha's de facto rulership covered the period between NS 476-483=1365-1361 A. D. Probably this happened to be the time when the de jure sovereign Jayarjuna was an infant and his sister Jagatsinha's wife a regent. By the marriage of Rajalladevi with Jayasthithi Malla the three warring houses of rulers, the Thakuris, the Karnatakas and the Mallas were united together in a common bond. It is also very probable that the Karnataka puppet mentioned in the chronicle was Rajalla's own brother.

To explain the ascendency of Jayasthithimalla Bendal's chronicle introduces certain kings of his dynasty but gives them inferior status. Levi also agreeing with him produces a list of six to cover the same unfilled up gap, and opines that some of them ruled at Bhatgaon[3], which however, still remains to be verified by paleographic evidence. Jayasthiti came to power in or before NS 484=1363 A. D. following the colophon of a MS (Bendal, Op. Cit, P27) and another MS shows him to be ruling in 1287 Saka=1375 A. D. Jayasthithimalla's previous career is also not yet assessed, but it is more probable that he served with Harisinha's descendants in the beginning. The conspiracy to overthrow Jayarjuna must have materialised in 1376 A. D. as we have a *Ms Bhojadeva Sangraha* of his reign copied in 1375 A. D. This was wrongly read as 1241 by H. P. Shastri[4].

1 Bendal, JASB, 1903, 1; Walsh, JRAS, 1908.
2 According to Jayaswal it was only a courtsey reference to have called him husband of Rajalla.
3 Levi, ii, PP 232-33.
4 JBAS, 1896, i, P313.

Jayasthithimalla's adoption of sovereign titles has confused this part of Nepal's history. All agree that he began his career as a chieftain and afterwards became the governor of Kantipur under Jayarjuna. But by no stretch of imagination it can be accepted that he at once became the King of Nepal with suzerainty over the entire valley in supercession of the latter. It seems that he assumed the de facto rulership behind the Suryavansi monarch of Bhatgaon. He might have afterwards declared himself independent and even usurped the throne as adduced by a Ms dated Ns 500 copied in Bhatgaon[1]. In Ns 503 (1383 A.D.) if the Vamshabali were to be taken seriously he was a full sovereign 'Jayarjuna having been broken' (Bendal, Intro, P12). But he could not totally do away with the incumbent on the throne, at least in matters of nominal loyalty. For we know that[2] in 1395-96 the reigning monarch Jayasinharana was styled Maharajadhiraja. This is further confirmed by the contemporary history of China. Sylvan Levi has proved from Chinese records of the Ming dynasty that embassies were accredited to Nepal in the name of the Sooryavansis (ii. P228) Levi calls them Sooryavansis following his Buddhist chronicle. Later as the same dynasty is shown by him to be a descendant line of the Tirhut ruler Harisinhadeva, he is closely referring to the same line of rulers whenever he mentions Sooryavansis. We do not know as yet whether it was due to the situation Bhatgaon enjoyed as a gateway to Tibet that the Chinese had dealings with the rulers of the place. But could it be that they had not in mind Kathmandu? The King who received the first Chinese Mission of the period, which visited Nepal in 1384 A. D. was King Mata-nalima identified with Matisinhadeva of the Chronicle. According to V[III] he ruled from Bhatgaon. Jayasinharana though not referred to by the Chinese annals may well be supposed to have retained the title conferred by them. There were two visits of the Chinese Missions during his reign period. The last mission came in 1414 A. D. when Cha-Ko-Sin li identified with Shaktisinhadeva was ruling. For the same period we have the sons of Jayasthithimalla as rulers verified from two Ms. records

1 Also see Inscription ix, of N. 512 Bendal's Journey, P81.

2 CPMDN, Intro, P29, Levi says that the affix *Rana* is used for the Tibetan word Lama. The Chinese mission might have introduced this title while talking of the ruler (ii. PP232-33).

(Bendal, Table) but as they are shown in the capacity of co-regents living in Bhatgaon we might easily deduce their position subordinate to the Karnataka monarchs. Another Malla prince calls himself a yuvaraj and this may also go to confirm the above conclusion[1]. All evidences considered, there is no reason to believe that Kathmandu was legally independent of Bhatgaon. Even Jayasthitimalla is being spoken of as *Daityanarayan* in a drama, *Abhinava Raghavananda*[2] by his court poet Manika. Levi (ii, 234-35) thinks that this title indicates the parentage of the King who was a descendant of Hirisinhadeva, as all of the latter's descendants have adopted *the Viruda of Narayana* (Comb. Addls 1108).

It is very difficult to accept Jayaswal's contention about Jayasthitimalla's origin from Harisinhadeva's stock. From a chronicle in his possession he even disbelieves the Thakuri lineage of Jayarjunadeva, and calls him Jayarjunamalla. He thinks that Jayasthiti being a subordinate of the Malla rulers had to add the Malla appendage to his name to be a favourite of the court. This, however, seems a very unconvincing argument, and even the reigning monarch would not have permitted him to adopt the royal family surname. Jayarjuna is simply Jayarjunadeva in the Swayambhunath inscription and one fails to understand as to how Jayaswal himself the person to recover and correctly read the content of the inscription, passes him as Jayarjuna Malla. From a Chinese source we know that even while Jayasthitimalla was ruling, there was a dejure sovereign by the name of Jayasinha, who was succeeded by Matisinha and the Chinese Ambassadors presented their credentials to them. Who were these rulers to whom Jayasthimalla acted as a subordinate? The affix *Sinha* in their names should either be taken as their decent from Hari sinhadeva or they must be the Thakuri successors of Jayarjunadeva. How is it that even after allowing himself to be addressed as sovereign he did not denounce the Malla appendage and adopt the common terminology of Sinhadeva after his name, which he should have done to prove his Karnataka parentage? It is clear that he had no sort of blood relationship with Harisinha's stock. Jayasthitimalla on all inferences was a Malla potentate, and was acting either as a Regent or a de facto ruler in the

1 Patan Inscription of 1413 A. D., No. 16 of I. A. ix, P183.

2 Camb. Addle, 1658.

capacity of an all powerful Prime Minister behind the puppet Karnataka monarchs. The Mallas figure in Nepalese history as de jure sovereigns two generations later, and they could usurp power only when Harisinha's successors were being totally eclipsed like Sivaji's successors during the regime of the last two Peshwas. Even in regard to earlier Mallas of the 13th Century A. D. it is difficult to say if they functioned in any capacity other than that of the Regents or Prime Ministers.

It appears that the Mallas had again come to be popular at the court for their powers in the fight against the Muslim invaders. Jayasthitimalla's rise can be mainly attributed to this period of convulsion, and not too long after he rose to be the most powerful man in the realm, though not necessarily to be the first.

Jayajyotirmalla, however, was in a position to overshadow the king and usurp his position even formally but except that he also had to respect the throne at the time when the Chinese mission was to be received. But for that he passed as a de jure and de facto sovereign, as may be concluded from his inscription[1]. He may be taken to be the first de jure monarch of the new line as since his time we do not hear of the original stock any more. He had adopted a grand-eloquent title of *Parameshwaraparamabhattaraka Maharaja*[2]. His reign lasted for 16 years till 1427 A. D.

Jyotirmalla was an astronomer and to make himself worthy of his name he had composed a treatise called *Siddhisara*. His inscription describes him as a learned man and master of music. He gained fame by dedicating *Kalasa* to Pashupatinath. Levi says that after 1418 A. D. the Sooryavansis were removed to Palanchok on the bank of the R. Sunkosi, 12 miles east of the valley.

- Yaksamalla, the eldest son of Jyotirmalla, was the most distinguished member of this line. He reigned from 1427 A. D. to 1470 A. D. During these 43 years he not only restored peace and prosperity to Nepal, this may be said to be the culmination of the process started by Jayarjuna and Jayasthiti, but also expanded his territory to the

1 No 16 of Bhagwal lal, IA, IX,
2 Ms. Siddhisara, CBMS, P 155

north and south covering places up to the Tibetan trade town of Digarche and the R. Ganges respectively. He had also curbed the violent hill tribes of the west and east. His conquest is described in full in the *Ms. Narapati jayacharya tika of Rajaputra Jagjyotimalla*[1], Yaksamalla's time coincided with the period of chaos in India antecedent to the Moghul consolidation, and, therefore, the story of his expansion may not be wholly untrue. There was no power in the plains to check him in his victorious march.

Yaksamalla like his father and grandfather was an orthodox Hindu and a devotee of Shiva. He elevated the temple of Dattatreya at Bhatgaon and set up the practice of worship of Pashupati by the Konkan Bhahmans of the south.

According to Levi's authority[2] Yaksha malla died in 1480 A. D. And died after enjoying fullfiledged sovereignty over his Kingdom. He was the first ruler of the Malla dynasty who became dejure monarch. *The Ms. Panchraksatrya* on the authority of L. D. Barnett[3] puts his death before 1475-76. A. D. for in that year we have *Maharajadhiraja Jayanripendramalla* in Kantipur, though nothing more is known about him or his parentage. This Ms fills a gap of 10 years in chronological chart. He may be the eldest son of Yakshamalla whom the chronicles do not take note of.

Whatever be the date of the death of Yaksamalla, his removal from the scene brought to Nepal chaos and disintegration. Nepal was divided into four principalities—each assigned to four descendants of his, two of which were important and existed for about two centuries in the state. Rayamalla got the portion of the country east of the River Bagmati; Bhatgaon and Sanga valley and all the territories lying between Sanga and Kuti in the north. Ratnamalla received the portion west of the R. Bagmati along with Patan upto Trishuli Gandak. Medinimalla received the territory lying east of Sanga upto to R. Dudhkosi and Ranamalla received the portion between Sanga and Banepa.

1 Read for his other Mss. CPMDN, P 23
2 Levi ii, P 238
3 Rai, ii, P 227

Before taking up these states separately let me state a few side facts relating to the division of Nepal. The above gives the idea that no amount of thought was given to the subject of proper delimitation of boundaries and the division was effected arbitrarily. It is possible that ultimately in all schemes of division the possession of swords determined the extent and area of each principality. The arbitrary character of the boundaries fixed may be cited with reference to the placing of Keraung under Bhatgaon which, however, no demarcating authority would tolerate as Kuti being just due north west of Kantipur would very well fall in the latter's sphere in normal course. Similarly when the northern boundary of Kantipur was fixed at Budhanilkantha, the portions lying in between the two, north of Nilkantha, e.g., the Kabilas, Narja and Dhaibung ranges and the valleys of Tadi and Trishuli had been indefinitely left out.

The existence of so many principalities in a small country with already a very lax and undefined system of administration was injurious to the larger interest of Nepal. It sowed seeds of confusion and skirmishes. Not only the territories adjacent to the valley fell into a state of anarchy, but places lying far in the east and west declared independent of the central power at Kathmandu. From Taranath we hear that as early as the 11th century A. D. that Palpa was existing as a separate Kingdom under the Senas[1]. During the same century hordes of Magar and Khasa tribes who had migrated to the region of seven Gandaks also occasionally defied the authority of the Nepal Kings. Some Rajput families from Rajasthan followed suit, and the whole of west Nepal was studded with petty feudal states. Thus the Baisees (twentytwo) and chaubisies (twentyfour) states were born. There was nothing like order in the country. All these petty Chieftains were independent of each other and fought like deadliest enemies. And to make confusion worse confounded every one of them looked to Delhi for favour and blessing. Now that there was no single unifying and controlling force to weld them together in Nepal, they could not but think to have been living at the mercy of the central authority at Delhi and yet independent enough to fight one

1 Taranath's Gesichte des Buddhism in India, Von A Schienfuer, P 25; Levi, ii, P p 188-89.

another. History seems to have followed the usual course.

Jayaswal thinks that Nepal was not indpendent since early tenth century, and it continud to exist in that condtlion down to 1768, the year of Gorkha conquest. But this seems to be a quite exaggerated view of the position Nepal then occupied. It may, however be correct to say that after the consolidation of Moghul power in India, Nepal in its dismembered state must have been forced in the very nature of things to accept Delhi's suzerainty. According to Tavernier the Nepal princes individually or collectively owed loyaty to the Moghul Emperors (II, ch. XV).

For the beginning of the 17th century we have the following feudal states extending from Kumaon to the valley of Nepal[1]: Doti, Jumla, Bajhang, Bajura, Acham, Chham, Dailekh, Selliana, Malneta, Rukamkot, Musikot, Roalpa, Garbhakot, Fallabang, Jajarkot, Jahari, Kalagaon, Darimeke, Bampli, Gutam, Gajur and Satatala. These principalities were each under a Raja holding his jurisdiction under the Raja of Jumla, who was regarded as the head of the group of Baisis (22). The Chaubisis (24) occupied the basins of the seven Gandaks from the R. Bheri to the R. Trisuhl comprising the areas extending from the district of Piuthan to No. I west district. These were Piuthan, Palpa, Gulmi, Nwakot, Argha, Khanci, Isma, Musikot, Golkot. Dhurkot, Parbat and Malaibum, Bhirkot, Garhonkot, Lamjung, Kashki, Tanhon and Makwanpor, Risingh, Ghiring, Dhor, Pun and Satahun, including Pokhra, Khuprikot, Bhiringikot and Gajkot, which were incorporated severally in one or other of the twenty states. Gorkha was ruled by a Magar chieftain till 1559 and lost its territories to Lamjung. It became independent of Lamjung under one of the latter's ruling family, some thirty years after. These chaubisis (24) seldom remained all separate. They seem to have federated in three or four groups and at one time in two under Palpa and Lamjung, the former headed all states up to the R. Seti.

1 Lists differ according to the sources, but they seem to agree in main details. For alien sources read Oldfield Vol. I pp 23-25; Kirkpatrnik p 283, Hamilton pp 130-50.

2 Mackwanpore occupied the midregion between the Terai and Sub Himalayan tracts of the valley just south and south west,

Far east of the valley there was a Kirata state comprising the basins of R. Dudhkosi and its tributaries and a portion of the Terai east of R. Sunkosi upto the present western boundary of the Jalpaiguri district.

Coming to the picture of Nepal proper for the same century we have two independent states divided as referred to earlier between two sons of Yaksamalla. Rayamalla ruled over Bhatgaon. We have a MS. of his reign, dated NS 616 (Cat. P 16). The chronicle has given him a reign of twelve years. His son Bhuwanamalla (HD 6) or Swarnamalla (VG) ruled upto 1524 A. D. The next nine years were covered by a joint regency under Jitmalla and Pranamalla[1]. The last ruled also as a de jure monarch from 1533-45, and was succeeded by Viswamalla who is credited to have improved on the Dattatraya temple and established hermitage for monks. Trailokyamalla, another ruler, defeated the attempts of a chieftain at Banepa to start troubles there. About Jagat Jyotirmalla, the next successor, we have three MSS (Camb. Addl 1687, 1696 and one of Deutochu Coll)[2]. About him the chronicle is lavish in praise and speaks of him as a great lover of music and attributes to him running theatrical performances. In collaboration with Vangamani a Maithili Pandit, he composed a treatise on music called *Sangeeta Bhaskara* (संगीतभास्कर) He was well versed in the *Bharata* School of Indian music and himself widely read the relevant portions in *Agnipurana*. To his authorship is also ascribed a comedy in Sanskrit, *Muditakuvalayaswa*, which according to Levi is superb masterpiece of the type of Kalidasa and Bhababhuti's works[3]. The subject matter of the drama is the marriage of God Shiva and his espouse Paravati. It is rich in melody and imagery though, of course, the language is much defective[4]. His successor Narendramalla ruled for 21 years down to 1653 A. D.

Ratnamalla was the third son of Yaksamalla to inherit the kingdom

1 Read for evidence of the chronicle.
Bendal's Nepal catalogue, Pp 107-09

2 Bendal, op. cit P169

3 Levi, ii, P242.

4 Analysis in the Katalog der Bibliothak der Deutscheu Morzan Landischen Gesel's chaft, Vol ii, MS no. 6.

of Kantipur. He is described in the chronicle as one very active, ambitious and without scruples. He killed the twelve Thakuri descendants who were a source of annoyance to him. He defeated the Thakuris of Nawakot and drove the Bhotias from his border with the help of the Sena rulers of Palpa[1]. Somasekhara, a Brahman of South India, could secure permanent position as the worshipper of God Pashupatinath and this fact was mainly instrumental in relegating the Buddhist Newars to the background, and thenceforth the latter yield place to outsiders in important sphere of public life and administration. He built the Taleju temple. According to the same chronicle Ratnamalla was much under the influence of Maithili-Brahmans who had also an intimate approach at the court of Palpa and they had brought about the unity of the two kingdoms on so many fundamental policies of state. Ratnamalla had issued small copper coins of the denomination of a pice by exploiting copper mines at Tamhakhani. He is credited with 71 years of reign by all the chronicles but Bendal's authority does not mention about him and his two successors.

Ratanmalla's successor Amarmalla ruled over 28 towns (26 Levi): Bandagaon, Lubhu, Thecho, Harisiddhi, Patan, Chapagaon, Pharping, Bungmati, Khokhna, Thankot, Balambu, Kirtipur and Halchok and adjacent places. For his successor Mahendramalla (Bendal's Journey) we have a MS (Camb. 135) dated NS 671 and he seems to have ruled for twenty years between 1555 A. D. as his two MSS dated NS 686 and NS 696 (Table II Journey) indicate[2]. Mahendramalla figures in the inscription of Siddhinarsinha (1635 A. D.) as his great grandfather. In his reign Purandar Rajavamshi built a temple of Krishna facing the Patan Durbar and according to Levi he is also the builder of Taleju temple erected on Bhatgaon model.

Mahendramalla is associated with the present silver coins of Nepal called Mahendra Malli. The legend also noted by all the chronicles credits him with securing a permission from the Delhi Moghul to open a mint in Nepal (Wright, P 207). It is also said that he received silver from Tirhut and his coins were circulated as legal tender throughout

1 See Levi, ii.

2 Addl 1355, Br. Museum 2206.

Nepal including the petty states and Tibet. But this particular assertion of the chronicle could not be verified by facts as no coins in the name of Mahendramalla have been recovered. In Kathmandu valley the earliest find is that of Lakshminarsinha, while the first available Nepalese coin in Tibet belongs to the name of Bhupatindramalla of Bhatgaon with Tibetan seal. Both Levi (ii, P216) and Walsh (P685) disbelieve the legend[1].

Sadashivamalla, Mahendra's son, was forced to abdicate and live in Bhatgaon as his misrule provoked revolt by his courtiers. Shivadevamalla, otherwise known as Shivadeva, was installed on the throne, thus rendered vacant. The chronicle says that he repaired the temple of Swayambhu and Changunarayan in collaboration with his wife. He had two sons Laksminar Sinha and Harinarsinha. Levi quotes a Brahman authority of chronology to show that the dynasty of Shivasinha was the Thakuri dynasty of Kathmandu, a smaller section of the Mallas, and that his wife Gangarani was devoted to him and helped him ably to conduct the administration. One of his two sons Harinarsinha is noted as the ruler of Patan in his inscription[2]. It seems that there was a further subdivision of Kantipur into two states. The part of the country with Kathmandu as the capital fell to Lakshminarsinha who was at first an exile in Deopatan probably for fear he entertained of his brother. Lakshminarsinha is the builder of the wood temple now known as Kastamandap, consecrated to the god Goraknath, which gives a name to the town. Banepa, east of Bhatgaon, outside the valley but in the immediate vicinity seems also to have enjoyed an independent existence for a short time as is attested by a MS. *Pandavavijaya* composed by the king Jayamalla of the place[3]. Nothing is known about his descendants. Perhaps this was again submerged in Bhatgaon. Bendal has also noted a principality in Nwakot 12 miles north west of the valley. This was also not of a long duration.

Our discourse of the history of Nepal ends here. The rest up till the rise of the Gorkha dynasty does better fit in with the events con-

1 For the coinage of Tibet read Walsh's article in JASB, ii, No. 2, P 11 ff. A friend very recently tells me that he saw a Silver coin of the name of Mahendramalla in the Collection of Suba Visnudhoj and it bears in the obverse the words, *Mahendramalladevasya Kastamandapasyadhipati.* But this has yet to be verified.

2 IA, xiii, P185.

3 Cf. Cat, PP115, 119.

nected with the origin and consolidation of that power, and therefore, we have left out the entire account after 1630 A. D. *for another thesis.*

Social condition: Polity

Nepalese polity of the period to follow its tradition centered round the system of double rule. As it happened earlier, it was to the fate of Nepal of this period as well to be ruled by two rulers at a time, one de facto and another de jure and both of them absolutely hereditary. And true to the previous history, the events in the medieval age likewise as in the one preceding would push the de facto ruler up to the farthest limit not only to overshadow the de jure head of the state in all civil duties but also to replace him. It was in that course that the Mallas obtained foothold in Nepal affairs, and later on became real rulers of the state to completely after sometime occupy the throne of the Karnatakas. The double rule system had become a very strong feature of Nepalese polity.

But another system of double rule, which involved also a method of sharing legal title to the throne was a speciality of the period under review. More often than not when the real power of the government did not vest in the head of the state, the throne was shared between two occupants. They became common rulers. It so worked that the law of primogeniture had ceased to be valid, and this position further led to territorial division when there were two de jure successors to the throne to exercise administrative functions. Of course, in a situation like this there was always a third party enjoying all the advantages, and the monarchy disunited paved the way for a structure where a new de facto ruler appeared. A system of joint rule had ultimately meant double rule of a de jure and a de facto rulers combined.

The de facto head passed as a regent, and as in the case of Jayasthitimalla even assumed epithets of royal address, and was called officially or otherwise as the protector of the realm. Nothing is known about other dignitaries, but there seem to be a number of feudatories called Rajas in charge of lesser administrative units. The regent obtained their allegiance and controlled the army which followed old methods of warfare and was equipped with bows and arrows. Gun-

powder and musket entered Nepal late in the 17th century along with the Rajput emigrants of the latter Moghul period.

We gain very little idea of the system of land revenue in practice. Religious endowments were very common and the *Goothi* as of today was a very important source of family subsistence. Taxes were realised from the transit trade and on Nepalese exports passing to Tibet.

Information about the social and economic condition of Nepal of the time in question is so meagre that unless and until a thorough exploratory work is conducted on the subject, nothing more can be authoritatively said.

It will be observed a little later from hence that all the magical rites of Vajrayana obtain intact even today. As a matter of fact the entire social texture of the Newar community is woven around its web, and at the time we have to deal with it was more so, the polity not excluded. Rulers had special function in the varied magic ridden society. Festivals and festivities were iniciated by the ruling monarch who was associated with each and every observance as it came and whose attitude towards supramundane universe determined the well being of the subjects ruled. Its festive occasions were numerous, and the ruler could maintain direct and intimate contact with the people through the channel of rituals. The medieval community shared with the Hindus in general a belief that the ruler was an incarnation of God and his participation in the customary celebrations had special meaning and it went to appease the angry spirits if any. Although the monarch was not a priest, he had social duties which made him very much susceptible to the influence exercised by that class, while his own position bordered on that of the deified personage and without being a magician he also exercised a considerable influence on the trend of events in his country. The entire aristocracy also played a partner's role in his functions of ceremonial character, and it so happened that the priest-class either, the Brahmans or the tantric Guvajus wielded immense power in the realm according as the ruler professed one or the other faith. The temporal Kazis of little or no religious influence who at a later date played a very important political part had not till then appeared in the scene.

A remarkable contribution to the annihilation of the strong aspect of national life and to its disintegration and dismemberment was the form of the joint rule just cited. This had become traditional since the time of Raghavadeva and assumed the character of an unavoidable national life. Under this system two rulers at a time could rule over a single dominion jointly or in division singly by one individual over separate parts as the case may be. So far as the two worked in perfect amity and concord, the political unity and territorial integrity of the state was not broken, but a state of schism between two rulers was an inevitable development often contributed by petty feeling of jealousy, and this led to disruption and division of territory in the country, which further drove a wedge in national solidarity tending always to the formation of petty principalities in turn. Nepal's ills were very much due to the prevalent system of joint rule but for which it could not have been disintegrated and broken into pieces in times of crisis.

Culture and Art

But this was not altogether an inglorious age for Nepal. Except for that factor contributing to territorial dismemberment and series of foreign invasions that affected the events of the period, Nepal recorded prideful achievements in many other spheres, particularly in those of literature and arts. Late as the process of disintegration started even that factor could not affect their progress in its earliest history of the time so that Nepal's cultural background remained practically untouched, and it was, therefore, not a surprise that the achievement was maintained while decay obtained elsewhere.

Indeed, the cultural aspect of national glory was remarkably great for that period. Apart from its contribution to the development and consolidation of the cult of *Vajrayana* in Tibet, which was no less valuable and Vajrayana was introduced into Tibet mainly with Nepalese efforts, Nepal gave to Tibet largely in this period of its history what yet the latter lacked, fine art and sculpture. From a Chinese source S. Levi discovered that the Nepalese message of culture had reached as far as central Asia and China. In the court of Kublai Khan a Nepalese builder was serving as the head of the Arts Department and he built

for him fine specimens of images and temples[1]. Archaeologists tell us that the Tibetan form of *stupa* with a little exaggeration of the range of umbrella is a copy of the Nepalese prototype of the 12th and 13th centuries. It was the time when the Government of Nepal maintained close diplomatic and cultural links with India and China, and exchanged scholars with these countries. A band of Nepalese scholars attended the university at Vikramshila, and they in turn did a lot of preaching work in Tibet. Taranath mentions Buddhasri, Ratnakirti, Vairochana and Kanakasri—all Nepalese scholars who had gone to Tibet as cultural ambassadors[2]. This was the position which every country then coveted and few could reach and all Asia's attention was riveted on Nepal for those very reasons.

It may be also noted here that Nepal's diplomatic and commercial contacts with Tibet and China were very intimate. Nepal's role as a liaison and entrepot trade carrier between India and Celestial Empire was not insignificant. For Tibet Kathmandu even minted coins, and naturally its hegemony over trade and commerce was acknowledged there.

This period of Nepalese history was one of the most energetic from the point of view of art and literary activities—including both Sanskrit and Newari. We have already seen how a very important part of history writing *i. e.* fixation of dates could be done only by the help of the MSS of the regimes concerned. But for these MSS the whole period would have remained in dark, as we know how the chronicles have proved thoroughly inaccurate and unreliable in this respect. The MSS were not only copy works as some would think them to be but included independent and original contributions of Nepalese authors who were born and brought up in Nepal. The valley seems to have been a very important seat of learning to which scholars flocked from all parts of India en route to Tibet and China. A few scholars from Vikramshila and Nalanda had found shelter there at the time of Mohammadan conquest of those places and it was largely owing to the hospitality they enjoyed

1 S. Levi, the Art of Nepal in Indian Arts and letters, I, 2, London 1925, PP63,65.

2 Op. Cit, PP214, 237, 249, 253,55,

in Nepal from the king and people that they escaped torture and annihilation. And Nepal also owes much to these scholars who have left a good number of literary works, many of them composed in the age they lived as noted in the colophons of the MSS.

This literary activity we speak of a time when it was mostly extinguished in the plains. The shelter Indian scholars found in Nepal was at a time when they happened to be severely persecuted there. The valley at the time occupied an importance. equal to that of Vikramshila and Nalanda before the Tughlak invasion. In the 13th century A. D. it had been practically the only place of Buddhist learning in India and as we have it from various MSS, scholars from India and Tibet were hailed and allowed to work under its care in the multiple monasteries.

Vajrayana and Caste

Much of what was achieved during this period was through the cult of Vajrayana practised en masse by the Nepalese people, though kings with a few exceptions professed Shaivism. The available MSS suggest that the Vajrayana cult obtained encouragement from every quarter not excluding the court at this time, even when the latter owed allegiance to other schools of worship. The Vajrayana itself developed in Nepal as a synthetic product of Hindu Tantra and Buddhist Mahayana ritualism, the combination of superstitions and magical form of Hindu worship with the intricate rituals of greater vehicle. The Acharyas of Vajrayana are said to hail from the Pala country and the cult probably entered Nepal through Bengal, and it found a fertile ground to thrive in the Kathmandu Valley as nowhere else a real harmony obtained as in that country. It may be taken rather to be the logical culmination of the forces of adjustment playing since a very long time.

Vajrayana was healthy in the sense that it kept alive the sense of unity and assisted the forces tending towards the same by creating a common platform of worship. The followers of this cult were only the Mahayanist Buddhist at the initial stage, but after some time it seems to have attracted also a good number of people from other sects. A reference to how this functioned in Nepal has been already made in connection with the community and arts and architecture belonging to

the valley. One thing still remains to be said and that is about Vajrayana as an unhealthy aspect of cultural degradation at a particular stage we deal with the same in the following paragraphs.

The study of Vajrayana is essential for the explanation of the causes of decay of Nepal in the centuries following its development. Vajrayana is formally consecrated in Nepal with the arrival of Atisha in the 11th century A. D. but it took some years more to ripe fully and the fullest development could be assigned to the 14th century. No idea of a decay of the rich past to have occurred in this century is made out in the above statement. What is meant is the birth of a process and its being in motion towards the results lending to widespread decay in social life, which brought in many alien invasions and finally to self effacement. The Vajrayana had tended to bear the seeds of destructive forces, and hit at certain fundamentals of Nepalese culture. It made life lax. It mitigated the idea of celebacy of monks which in its turn destroyed the heritage of a scholarly past –the monasteries were emptied So the precious value which was spared out of the centuries of anarchy and disorder was swept away by Vajrayana wave in its decadent course. Since then we have a rigid caste structure in Newari social life, and the whole democratic basis of life is done away with.

The Caste System which was running very irregular since the 10th century A. D. after the break Hinayana sustained it was quite non-existent before that time, got regularised and hardened in due course, and monasteries dying out produced the priest class of the Buddhist community, its monks easily turned into priests under the influence of Vajrayana ritualism. What Vajrayana started, Shaiva influence later on consolidated and hardened, and when it emerged into a developed form, there was nothing but a fullfledged caste hierarchy and caste complex in the picture. The chronicles speak of this process of consolidation and regularisation in alluding to Jayasthitimalla's contribution, and some eighty-five castes are mentioned in that connection to have taken shape in the most petrified state. This was the age when the casteless character of Buddhist Society in general underwent a Kaleidoscopic change and gave way to the formation of a rigid caste structure, which affected the mass of the people unlike such influences in the past touching only a

fringe that was the aristocracy. A complex caste structure is again the mould cast by the Vajrayana cult whose intricate rituals gave a distinct caste mark to each assignment and every family with a specialised performance stratified into a block of caste. Leaving aside the recent emigrants into the valley, who more or less seem to have brought a dominant culture to bear on life, the original settlers have definitely developed a variety ranging over from customary practices down to the very details. Superstitions and magical beliefs had hardened into religiosity and rites and usages accompanying these could create their own caste bases, so that at the tail end of this period we find a complexity equal only to that of Brahmanical society. The present day caste structure and medieval social life of the Newars much ridden as it is with superstition and magic is a legacy of the time when Vajrayana flourished.

Brahman dominated Shaivism was no less influential. In fact the original social texture of the inhabitants of the Nepal valley is a result of the interaction between the local Budddist community and alien Hindu emigrants who politically dominated the scene for a long time. Shaiva influence, however, was confined to the upper strata of society as previously noted, but in the period we make note of this reached the lowest layer. We hear in this time a large number of Brahmans from Bengal and Mithila settling down in the valley, and they weaned away from the other fold not a few adherents, and permeated the rest overwhelmingly with their own as is seen in the many quaint customs and manners of the society at Kathmandu, that betray indelible marks of Brahmanical culture. Since their time again Hinayana School of Buddhism totally loses ground, and Buddhist monks becoming priests establish their predominance in terms of caste. But it must be said about the Buddhist section of the Newars that endogamy is not so rigid with them and that within a particular caste democratic way of life still persists (for a further fuller study of Nepal's Newar community read the initial three articles of this book) Also except the very low and degrading profession there was sufficient latitude of a choice of profession.

Since the 15th century A. D. we also notice Newar traders expanding towards the extreme west and east of Nepal, and this may be atrributed to opening of routes due to new settlements in these places. What was previously a dense forest belt is now a habitat full of swarming

emigrants, and the valley of Kathmandu for the first time could establish contacts with these regions, and this outlet was utilised by the trading class to extend its own influence. It is possible that the Newar settlers in the hill areas, specially in the remote corners went there in furtherance of trade interests.

The colourful parts of Newari social life, all its magical rites and ceremonies and celebrations and there are too many of them all the year round, began during this epoch of the Nepalese history under the influence of Hindu Tantras and Bauddha Vajrayana. Their importance for Nepal is more for the reason that they still hold the ground in spite of superstition generally dying out in other parts of the world. The social life of the valley is still largely governed by magic and superstition following a Tantric mode of worship, and the philosophy of life behind the same.

The Tantric conception of universe was a magic ridden demonaic world, gods as redeemers and all observances social or individual, and creations and images, mental or architectural in Nepal bore evidence of the fact that these were tied to this unphilosophic notion.

Vajrayana had also inspired arts and sculpture, and a great many famous temples existing at present were built in this period. The Malla Kings took delight in encouraging activities of the type and themselves led such of them and they were great builders.

To them is ascribed Nepals's most excellent temples, pillars and carved images, and the earlier works having been demolished in the preceding age these remain the only treasures of the past, and therefore for us the more valuable. Medieval Nepal owes to these royal builders all that is to its credit[1].

In this period Nepal was also destined to make an appreciable mark in painting and music. In the latter sphere the rulers themselves figure as great composers and singers. Many of the local adaptations of the Indian *Ragas* and *Ragnis* that do still exist, and

---

1 For a study of Nepalese sculpture and architecture see the following: A Coomaraswany, History of Indian and Indonesian Art, PP 144-46 and all references therein. Also see ante in this book, the article on Art and Architecture Havell, Indian Art and Architecture, Fourier, etc.

are tuned to perfection, belong to medieval age. We have already noted in the previous column the works on music and drama by royal authors. These are excellent treatises on the subjects. One royal author is even credited with combining the role of a playwright with that of a player. Painted art is available but not on a large seale. As observed earlier in connection with our description of art and architecture we get their specimens from only the painted wooden panel covers of the MS. works. There is much of Pala influence in them. They may be due to the influx of scholars from Vikramshila and Nalanda on the eve of the Muslim conquest of Bengal. In the words of A. Coomaraswamy "In the eleventh century indeed, the distinction of style between Nepali and Bengali illustrated MSS is so slight to be scarcely definable in few words." Most of these are not available in Nepal. Some are deposited in Musem of Fine Arts, Boston. The latter's possession of *Asta Sahasrika prajnaparamita* no. 20,589 contains a number of miniatures of great qualities, which is roughly put to 1136 A. D. Two copies of the same at the Royal Asiatic Society of Calcutta, Palm Leaf Manuscripts Add, 1643, have each 85 and 31 miniatures. Another notable find is the panel in *Vassantara Jataka* in Vrendenburg's collection. The Royal Asiatic Society of London have in their keeping a fine specimen of Nepalese *Vaishnava* painting in the *Gajendra moksa* pictures. The Temple banner of the period, particularly the one with illustrations of*Kapisa* and *Pindapatra Avadans* dated 1716 A. D. have passed as creation of high qualities in colour and design[1].

Literature

Coming to literary activities proper, let it be suggested that the kings treated all scholars, Shaivites or Buddhists, on a footing of equality and we obtain in this period literary works belonging to all schools of thought and faith. They exhibit a variety of taste and style. In this time also was copied in Nepal a large number of MS. works in Sanskrit from India. It is unfortunate that the bulk of MS. works both original and copies got lost in the humdrum and bustle of the aftermath attending alien invasions and internecine strifes of the rulers themselves.

1 For a detailed description of Nepalese painting see ante the section on Art and Architecture. Also read E. Vrendenburg's article on Art in India, Rupam 12, 1920 cited by A. Coomaraswamy in his History of Indian and Indonesian Art.

Sanskrit was not the only medium patronised. For the first time in the history of Nepal its rulers encouraged writing in Newari language. At about the same time indigenous dialects were being encouraged all over India, and they were gradually taking the shape of literary languages. From the contemporary history of India, it appears that Tamil and Hindi were coming to the front and their earliest forms were in evidence. We have said that Newari had held the field for a long time as a spoken language. As one of the oldest members of the Mongolian stock, it has a significance for the historian equal to that of Tibetan. It was, however, not patronised till then by men of culture and learning, who did their work in Sanskrit. But from the 10th century A. D. the court became alive to the need of giving a lift to Newari, the language of the people, and some valuable works were written in that language which, of course, do not exist at present having been extinguished in flames in periods during and following the Muslim conquest. I have heard that the Durbar Librarv consists of a few books in Newari of a time as old as the tenth century A. D. There may be more in the archives of the old Viharas. Some precious works have been also taken away by westerners. An idea of the extent of help received by Newari can be obtained from the way the inscriptions and MSS have added the last portion of their statements on this language, which we would not find in the older inscriptions.

The rich variety of scripts we are so proud of, at the moment is ascribed to this period. The Gupta script is the oldest script traceable in the Nepal Valley as nowhere in this country inscriptions or plates with Brahm and Kharosthi characters are available. The Gupta script was in vogue till the 9th century A. D. Our period witnessed an enviable record of development in this line. Almost all the later scripts, Bhujimo, Gomo, Ranjana, etc. were the contributions of this age, while the scholars also had a tendency to adopt outside scripts like Maithili and Bengali as well. All these are taken to be derived from the Guptan Script, the Ranjana being the earliest of them and this has a pictographic appearance. And a very usual feature of the literary activity was the large share of the royal patrons in the pool of literary productions. These are noted in particular places with reference to MS works of the time of the ruling monarchs concerned and all of them are in Sanskrit.

Industry and Trade.

Industry and Trade flourished side by side of the cultural activities. Nepal produced its own cotton, span its own thread and wove the cloth required, and every Jyapu and Udas household had its own handloom. The valley maintained a monopoly of handloom industry, and the surplus was exported to hill areas and Tibet. Brassware, bronze statues of deities and worship paraphernalia, silver and gold ornaments of Patan were another high class products, and these also found their way to regions outside Nepal specially to Tibet. Till the eighteenth century Nepal was the trade link between China and India. The imports to Nepal from Tibet consisted mainly of herbs, salts, Yaktail, silver, gold and from India spices, salt and emboridery and silk cloth; India obtained herbs, hides, wooden frame, hides and bones and certain metal goods from Nepal at that time. Nepal also supplied to Tibet a fair quantity of chillies, onions and beans. As legend speak Nepalese chillies were exported even to far off China.

Coinage.

Except for Jayarjunadeva no coins of the reigning monarchs have been traced. This led many scholars to believe that coins struck by the Central Power in India were current in Nepal which had lost its independence during the period of eight hundred years from the tenth to eighteenth century. But mere absence of coinage cannot be a basis of arguments and to attribute to Nepal of those days a dependent status on that account would be going too far. We are too short of factual data and materials much as they still lie hidden, and require thorough search and exploration, and our efforts in that direction have been so far tardy. It is true that off and on during this long span of time Nepal was subjected to invasions from the south, and any strong power organised for the whole of India or anywhere in Nepal's vicinity did not leave this country quite untouched in one or other ways. But no one with a knowledge of Indian and Nepalese history would with authority speak of continued status of dependence for Nepal for the same period. While coins have been discovered in two cases attacks have also been repelled more than once, which certainly testifies to Nepal's capacity to resist encroachments on its sovereignty. Also it is impossible to imagine

that Nepal continued to enjoy a status of dependence even at the time when India lay disintegrated and dismembered. If a contrary-opinion is to prevail, Nepal has to be given a subordinate place even in the 13th, 14th and 15th centuries when there was neither a consolidated power in Bengal, nor anywhere in north India. Moghul suzerainty in Nepal seems, however, a certainty, but their empire covered the whole of India. Another fact to be borne in mind is that even where Nepal seemed to accept a dependent role, it was only in a nominal sense and external suzerainty obtained but in name, for its mountain fastness and inaccessible situation protected the country from active interference.

Emigration from North West

We have already referred to migration from the Indian plains that took place in this period. Early twelfth and thirteenth centuries also saw hordes in this side of the Himalayas from north west Tibet. The Magar and Gurung tribes probably belong to this swarm of northern emigrants. These people speak a monosyllabic dialects which bear a close resemblance with those spoken by Sherbas and Tamangs who came to Nepal much earlier and betray physiognomy and culture of Tibetan origin. About the Gurungs and Magars to say anything authoritatively would be hazardous, but it may be safely observed that they belong to Mongol race more than any other tribes inhabiting this side of the Himalayas. They look different from the Tibeto-Burman race, but have a culture similar to theirs as obtaining in Nepal. They are yet animists and to a certain extent are influenced by Hindu Brahmans. Before they were routed in the battle fields and subjugated by the Rajputs, the Gurungs and Magars controlled a big slice of hilly tracts between the rivers Kali and Tadi, an expansion nearly one hundred miles in breadth.

Almost all the emigrant tribes except the Thacksays of the border areas inhabiting the lowlands in the upper Himalayas live in the mid-slopes of the sub-Himalayas region while at the foot of the mountains in the river valleys dwell the settlers of Indian origin. It is possible that as a result of pressure by the northern emigrants the aborigines like the Kusundas and Chepangs have been pushed further South.

The latter are still living in savage conditions, and have not even adopt pastoral life.

Nepal valley had always extended its sway over tribal areas as it enjoyed superior culture. The problem of allocating to these people a distinct polity would, therefore, not arise. In the north eastern region through which Nepal maintained its contact with Tibet they were probably being used as porters for carrying articles of trade.



